DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 090 348 UD 014 169

AUTHOR	Feaster, J. Gerald; Perkins, Garey B.
TITLE	Families in the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program: Comparisons of Food Stamp and Food Distribution Program Participants and Nonparticipants.
INSTITUTION	Economic Research Service (DOA), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	AER-246
PUB DATE	Sep 73
NOTE	57p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Family Characteristics; Family Health; Family Income; Family Problems; Family Resources; Federal Aid; *Financial Support; Foods Instruction; Food Standards; *Health Programs; *National Surveys; *Nutrition; Nutrition Instruction; Poverty Programs
IDENTIFIERS	Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program

ABSTRACT

This report compares food consumption and socioeconomic profiles of families participating and not participating in the United States Department of Agriculture's (USDA) food stamp of food distribution programs. Also, regional comparisons of the profiles are made and factors associated with income and food expenditures identified. The sample was drawn from homemakers in the USDA Extension Service's Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP). This program, launched in 1969, has the goal of improving the nutrition knowledge and diets of poor families. A related objective is to encourage program families to enroll in USDA food assistance programs. Sampled homemakers receiving food stamps had better diets, larger families, and higher incomes than homemakers in the food distribution program or those eligible for but not participating in a food assistance program. Approximately 37 percent of EFNEP families participated in USDA food assistance programs in 1969. Significant differences in socioeconomic characteristics and food consumption practices existed among EFNEP families according to their food assistance program status. Among participants and those eligible but not participating, food stamp families fared best in both economic and food consumption characteristics. Food assistance recipients and eligible nonparticipants ranked below ineligibles in economic and food consumption characteristics. (Author/JM)

ED 090348

Agricultural Economic Report No. 246

FAMILIES IN THE EXPANDED FOOD AND NUTRITION EDUCATION PROGRAM:

Comparison of Food Stamp and Food Distribution Program Participants and Nonparticipants

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

UD 011 160

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE • Economic Research Service

ABSTRACT

Socioeconomic and food consumption profiles of families in the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) are presented according to their food assistance status during 1969. This includes profiles of food stamp and food distribution program participants, eligible nonparticipants, and ineligible families. EFNEP is administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Extension Service.

Significant differences in socioeconomic characteristics and food consumption practices existed among EFNEP families according to their food assistance program status. Among participants and those eligible but not participating, food stamp families fared best in both economic and food consumption characteristics. Food assistance recipients and eligible nonparticipants ranked below ineligibles in economic and food consumption characteristics.

Regression analysis identified significant factors contributing to variations in food expenditures and family income. Income and family size were among the variables significantly related to food expenditures, while education and family size were among those significantly related to family income.

Keywords: Low-income families, consumption, food, human nutrition, poverty, income, expenditures.

PREFACE

This report is based on a sample of families in the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) of the Department of Agriculture's Extension Service. The report compares food consumption and socioeconomic profiles of families participating and not participating in the USDA food stamp or food distribution programs. Also, regional comparisons of the profiles are made and factors associated with income and food expenditures identified. Officials responsible for directing food and nutrition education and assistance programs have a continuing need for information on the population being reached and the impact of these programs on participants.

This study was conducted by the National Economic Analysis Division of USDA's Economis Research Service at the request of and under memorandum of agreement with the Food and Nutrition Service (USDA). Data used for the analysis were made available through the cooperation of the Extension Service.

A related publication is Impact of the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program on Low-Income Families: An Indepth Analysis, by J. Gerald Feaster. (Econ. Res. Serv; U.S. Dept. Agr., Agr. Econ. Rept. No. 220, 73 pp. Feb., 1972.)

Percentages in tables may not add to 100 due to rounding.

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

Food Reading

A food reading includes information on homemaker's food consumption practices, homemaker's food knowledge, family income, and family food expenditures. The aide obtained this information from family homemaker after enrollment and at 6-month intervals thereafter.

Monthly Income

This is an estimate of before-tax family income received during the month prior to the food reading. In addition to salaries and wages, income includes gifts and welfare, social security, retirement, and insurance payments. Value of bonus food stamps and donated foods was not included as income.

Monthly Food Expenditures

This is an estimate of money spent for food, including credit, during the month prior to the food reading. The estimate includes food purchased and eaten away from home, but does not include values of food from home gardens or food received as gifts or under USDA's Food Distribution Program. Where the family participated in the Food Stamp Program, the value of bonus food stamps was not included as a food expenditure. Also excluded were amounts spent for alcoholic beverages, tobacco, paper goods, soaps, pet foods, and other nonfood items purchased at grocery stores.

Urban

Families living in places with at least 2,500 persons and in closely settled fringe areas surrounding cities of 50,000 or more.

Rural Nonfarm

Families living outside urban areas and not operating a farm.

Farm

Families living outside urban areas and operating a farm.

Food Stamp Families

Families who participate in USDA's Food Stamp Program, under which they receive food stamps and bonus food stamps the value of which depends on family size and income.

Food Distribution Families

Families who participate in USDA's Food Distribution Program, under which they receive food products donated by USDA. Quantity of food received depends on family size.

Eligible Nonparticipants

Families who meet the standards of eligibility for a food program in their State of residence, but who do not participate in such a program.

Ineligible

Families who do not meet the eligibility standards for food program participation in their State of residence.

States Included in Geographical Region

Northeast:	Connecticut
	Maine
	Massachusetts
	New Jersey
	Pennsylvania
	Vermont
North Central:	Illinois
	Indiana
	Iowa
	Michigan
	Minnesota
	Missouri
	Nebraska
	Ohio
	South Dakota
	Wisconsin
South:	Alabama
	Arkansas
	Florida
	Georgia
	Kentucky
	Maryland
	Mississippi
	North Carolina
	Oklahoma
	South Carolina
	Tennessee
	Texas
	Virginia
	West Virginia
West:	Arizona
	Colorado
	New Mexico
	Oregon
	Washington

CONTENTS

	Page
Summary	v
Introduction	1
Objectives and Procedures	1
Source of Data	2
Sampling	2
Family Profile by Food Program Status	3
Food Stamp Families	3
Food Distribution Families	5
Nonparticipating Eligible Families	5
Ineligible Families	6
Families Joining and Leaving Food Programs	6
Family Profile by Region	7
Food Consumption Practices	8
Food Program Comparisons	9
Regional Comparisons	11
Food Consumption Practices by Socioeconomic Characteristic	11
Change in Food Consumption Practices	12
Factors Associated with Income and Food Expenditures	12
Family Food Expenditure Models	14
Income-Food Expenditure Relationships	18
Family Income Models	19
Appendix Tables	23

Washington, D.C. 20250

September 1973

SUMMARY

The sample was drawn from homemakers in the USDA Extension Service's Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP). This program, launched in 1969, has the goal of improving the nutrition knowledge and diets of poor families. A related objective is to encourage program families to enroll in USDA food assistance programs.

Sampled homemakers receiving food stamps had better diets, larger families, and higher incomes than homemakers in the food distribution program or those eligible for but not participating in a food assistance program.

Approximately 37 percent of EFNEP families participated in USDA food assistance programs in 1969. Twenty-three percent were enrolled in the food distribution program and 14 percent received food stamps. A relatively large proportion of EFNEP families--one in four--were eligible but not participating in either program. Twenty-eight percent were ineligible because of higher incomes or smaller family size. Participation in food assistance programs expanded by 14 percent over a 6-month period for a subsample of EFNEP families included in the study.

Socioeconomic characteristics were compared for food stamp and food distribution families, eligible nonparticipants, and ineligible nonparticipants during 1969. Families in all groups had low incomes, lived mainly in urban areas, had minority racial or ethnic backgrounds, and relatively low educational levels. About one-third of all families were on welfare. The group with the largest proportions of black families and urban residents were nonparticipating eligibles. Educational levels were lowest for food distribution and eligible nonparticipant homemakers, with both averaging less than 8 years of schooling. Welfare participation among assistance families was substantially higher than for nonparticipating families.

Average family income was approximately $200 per month for food stamp participants and $165 for both food distribution and eligible nonparticipating families. These estimates include welfare payments but do not include the value of donated foods and bonus food stamps. Food stamp families were considerably larger, at 5.5 members, than either food distribution or eligible nonparticipating families. Although food stamp participants had larger family food expenditures--excluding bonus food stamps--food expenditures per person equaled those of eligible nonparticipating families. Nonparticipating eligibles spent more than 40 percent of their income for food--a higher rate than for any of the other groups.

The income of ineligible families exceeded $300 per month. Only 7 percent were on welfare, and average family size was 4 members. Compared with other families, ineligibles were more urban, had fewer blacks, and were less often on welfare. The economic advantages of these families were reflected in their higher incomes and food expenditures. Also, they spent a smaller proportion of family income for food and had better food consumption practices.

Comparisons among regions, regardless of food program status, showed that Southern families had the lowest incomes and food expenditures, the largest proportion of blacks, and the lowest food stamp participation rate. Also, Southern homemakers were the oldest and had the lowest educational levels. Western and Northeastern families had the highest monthly incomes--approaching $300--and the highest food expenditures--nearly $100 per month. North Central families were the most urban--three of four--and Western families were the least--less than one-half. Northeastern families had the highest proportion of whites, the highest rate of welfare participation, and the highest proportion of families shopping primarily at supermarkets. Western homemakers had the best diets, followed by homemakers in the North Central States; Southern homemakers had the poorest.

Puerto Rican homemakers, although not included in the above comparisons, also had very poor diets and their families had very low incomes and food expenditures.

Family size, homemaker's education, ethnic group or race, region, residence (rural or urban), and welfare status were significantly related to income levels. Family size and income also had highly significant effects on family food expenditures. According to the regression coefficients, increased incomes for all groups would result in larger food expenditures. However, the analysis indicated that typical food program families and eligible nonparticipants increased their food expenditures more than $0.20 in response to $1 income increments, a rate more than twice that of ineligible families.

FAMILIES IN THE EXPANDED FOOD AND NUTRITION EDUCATION PROGRAM: Comparison of Food Stamp and Food Distribution Program Participants and Nonparticipants

by
J. Gerald Feaster and Garey B. Perkins
Agricultural Economists
National Economic Analysis Division

INTRODUCTION

The Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) of the Extension Service was implemented in 1969 to improve the nutrition knowledge and diets of low-income families. The program operates in the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. By August 1971, the program had reached 2.9 million persons in 600,000 program families. Subject matter covered by the program includes essentials of nutrition; meal planning; food buying, storage, preparation, and serving; sanitation practices; and related topics. Primary recipients of the food and nutrition effort are homemakers of low-income families. They receive instruction from paid nonprofessional program aides who are trained and supervised by professional home economists.

Both this study and the related study mentioned in the preface drew on a sample of over 10,500 EFNEP families who had participated during 1969. Most sample families had low incomes, lived in urban areas, were from minority racial or ethnic groups, and had homemakers with relatively little schooling. About a third of the families were on welfare. Average family income was $2,500; more than a third of this was spent on food. In 1969, 37 percent of the sample families participated in either one of two USDA food assistance programs--14 percent received food stamps and 23 percent were in a food distribution program. 1/ Nearly all of the sample families lived in areas where one of the two programs was operative, and about three-fourths were eligible to participate. One objective of EFNEP is to encourage eligible families not in a food assistance program to enroll in one.

Objectives and Procedures

The overall objective of this study was to analyze the characteristics of low-income EFNEP families who participate and who do not participate in food assistance programs. This was accomplished through a detailed examination of socioeconomic characteristics of sample EFNEP families by food program status--(a) families enrolled in the food stamp program, (b) families enrolled in the food distribution program, (c) families eligible but not participating in a food assistance program, and (d) families not eligible to participate.

Specific objectives of the study were to:

(1) Determine the proportion of food program eligibility among non-participating EFNEP families.

(2) Construct and compare socioeconomic and food consumption profiles of families by food program status and region.

1/ Aggregate data compiled by USDA's Economic Research Service and Extension Service showed that in 1972 this had increased to over one-half of the program families.

(3) Compare food consumption practices and food expenditures by food program status and selected socioeconomic characteristics.

(4) Determine effect of income, family size, and other socioeconomic variables on family food expenditures by food program status.

(5) Determine effect of education, race or ethnic group, residence, and other socioeconomic variables on family income by food program status.

Source of Data

The data for this report were obtained from the national sample of 10,500 individual EFNEP family records mentioned earlier. Program units keep records on all families. These records are the basis for program evaluation and monitoring. Basic data for the evaluation were obtained by nonprofessional program aides whose primary responsibility is teaching program families. Methods used to obtain the information were developed in such a manner that the data could be collected by the aides and provide a reasonable indicator of results. The method of data gathering was carefully designed to provide a basis for continuous monitoring over the entire national program and not interfere with the aides' basic teaching responsibility. These restraints imposed limitations, of which the reader should be aware, on the manner of collecting food consumption and expenditure data and the detail of the data. However, examination of data from EFNEP operations over a 3-year period 2/ shows a high degree of reasonableness and consistency and findings similar to those obtained in other studies.

Information on families was obtained from a family record completed upon enrollment in EFNEP and food readings taken as soon as possible after enrollment and at 6-month intervals thereafter. A food reading is a record of food consumption practices of the family homemaker, monthly family income, and monthly family food expenditures. To obtain food consumption information, the aide asked the homemaker to recall foods she had eaten during the previous 24 hours. Each time a food was consumed during the day was counted as a serving of the respective food group, except when the intake was believed to be insignificant. 3/ The aides also asked the homemaker to estimate income and food expenditures for the previous month, excluding the value of bonus food stamps or donated foods.

Food program status of sample families was ascertained at the initial food-reading date only. Determination of eligibility for nonparticipants was made on the basis of State requirements, expressed in terms of income and family size. 4/

Sampling

The sample was selected in May 1970 from families that enrolled prior to October 1969. A two-stage sampling procedure was used. A sample of program units was selected from among 390 EFNEP units that reported families with two food readings as of October 1969. Families were then selected from these sample units. The 390 units were stratified by size, and large units--which were fewer--were sampled at a higher rate than the more numerous smaller units. One hundred and thirty-four units were selected in this manner. The family sampling rate from the units in a given stratum was such that the overall stratum sampling rate was one-twelfth. The unit and family sampling rate used for the five strata are summarized below.

2/ State and national summaries of EFNEP operation, 1969-72.

3/ The foods were classified into food groups by a trainer-agent. For more information on the food consumption, income, and food expenditure measures, see pp. 8-12.

4/ An exception was Puerto Rico, which had welfare participation as the only eligibility requirement. Additional requirements which may be unique to individual States, such as family assets, were not used in determining eligibility.

Family data were available on about 10,500 of the sample families. Approximately 9,500 had initial food reading data and about 2,800 of the latter group had two food readings. The families were categorized by food program status. However, it was not possible to categorize some because of insufficient data on family income and enrollment dates. About 8,000 of the families were classified as being in either the food stamp or food distribution program or as being eligible or ineligible nonparticipants.

Stratum	Unit size (number of families)	Sampling rates (Unit)	(Family)	(Stratum)
1	700 and more	1	1/12	1/12
2	400-699	1/2	1/6	1/12
3	200-399	1/3	1/4	1/12
4	100-199	1/4	1/3	1/12
5	less than 100	1/6	1/2	1/12

FAMILY PROFILE BY FOOD PROGRAM STATUS

Thirty-seven percent of the sample families were in a food program (table 1). Nearly 30 percent of the sample families had sufficiently large incomes and/or sufficiently small family sizes that they were not eligible to participate in a food program in their State of residence. However, one in four was eligible but not participating. Reasons for nonparticipation could not be ascertained from available data. Most families had one of the two food programs in their counties. Another 10 percent of the sample families were not in a food program and their eligibility could not be determined because family income data were not available (table 1).

Table 1--Distribution of EFNEP participating families by program status, 1969

Food program status	Number 1/	Percent of total
Assistance	3,301	
Food stamp	1,270	14
Food distribution	2,031	23
Nonassistance	5,722	
Eligible	2,306	25
Ineligible	2,494	28
Unclassified 2/	922	10
Total	9,023	100

1/ Does not include sample families who did not have a food reading nor those not reporting a date for the first food reading.
2/ Missing data on family income prevented classification as to eligibility.

Food Stamp Families

Fourteen percent of the sample families received food stamps. Slightly more than one-half of EFNEP families who received food stamps were urban. Food stamp families had the highest proportion of families residing on farms--12 percent (table 2). More

Table 2—Selected characteristics of EFNEP participating families, by food program status, 1969

Characteristic of family or homemaker	Assistance[1]		Nonassistance eligible	Ineligible	All families
	Food stamp	Food distribution			
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Residence:					
Urban	51	48	58	65	58
Rural nonfarm	37	41	34	30	34
Farm	12	11	9	5	8
Racial or ethnic group:					
White	39	35	28	30	32
Black	53	52	60	44	52
Spanish American	6	12	11	25	14
Other[2]	2	3	1	1	2
Welfare status:					
On welfare	59	52	33	7	33
Not on welfare	41	48	67	93	67
Families shop primarily at –					
Supermarkets	76	58	70	77	71
Small local stores	22	40	27	19	25
Both	2	2	4	4	4
Region of residence:					
Northeast	14	11	8	5	10
North Central	24	9	16	14	15
South	56	73	72	63	66
West	6	1	3	4	3
Puerto Rico	—	6	1	14	6
	Dollars	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*
Monthly family income and food expenditures (averages):[3]					
Income	198	161	166	320	221
Per capita	36	32	32	73	46
Food expenditure	76	59	69	93	76
Per capita	14	12	14	21	16
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Income spent for food	38	37	42	29	34
	Years	*Years*	*Years*	*Years*	*Years*
Age of homemaker	42	47	45	39	43
Education of homemaker	8.1	7.3	7.8	8.8	8.0
	Number	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*
Family size	5.5	5.0	5.1	4.4	4.8
Families reporting	1,270	2,031	2,306	2,494	[4]10,524

[1] Status at time of first food reading. [2] Includes American Indians and orientals. [3] Income estimated before figuring taxes. Income and food expenditure estimates do not include values of donated food and bonus food stamps. [4] Includes those families for which food program status was not determined and also families which did not report a food reading.

than one-half, or 53 percent, were black. This proportion was exceeded only by eligible nonparticipants, 60 percent of whom were black. Almost 60 percent of food stamp families were on welfare, the largest percentage among all sample groups.

More than three-fourths of food stamp families shopped primarily at supermarkets. Food stamp families, forming a large nonurban component, shopped at supermarkets in about the same proportion as the predominantly urban ineligibles.

Food stamp families reported an average monthly income of nearly $200; 38 percent of this, or $76, was spent for food. Even though their monthly food expenditures were higher than those of eligible nonparticipants, their larger average family size resulted in identical per capita food expenditures. Food stamp families had more children in the school lunch program than any other group.

Food stamp homemakers ranked above food distribution and eligible nonparticipant homemakers in education. They averaged 8.1 years of schooling and 42 years of age.

Food Distribution Families

Families receiving donated food constituted 23 percent of the total sample (table 1) This was the only category with a majority living in nonurban areas (table 2). Over 40 percent of these families had a home garden, reflecting the rural composition of this category.

Families receiving donated food were similar to food stamp families in terms of percentage of blacks. However, food distribution families had fewer whites and more Spanish Americans than food stamp families, because food distribution was the only food program available in Puerto Rico (table 3). Slightly more than one-half of food distribution families were on welfare, compared with 60 percent of food stamp families.

Food distribution families ranked relatively lower than other categories in many of the socioeconomic characteristics studied. They had lower average incomes than any other category. However, their $161 per month was only slightly less than the $166 for nonassistance eligibles, but was just over one-half as much as the $320 for ineligible families. Monthly food expenditures of food distribution families were considerably below those of food stamp families--$59, compared with $76. However, food distribution families were smaller--5.0 persons, compared with 5.5 for food stamp families--and they spent $2 less per person for food than food stamp families. Food distribution families spent a smaller percentage of their monthly income for food than either food stamp or nonassistance eligible families.

Homemakers in food distribution families were older, averaging 47 years, and had fewer years of education--7.3 years--than homemakers in other categories.

Nonparticipating Eligible Families

These families met income and family size requirements for food program assistance but did not participate. They constituted a quarter of all sample families. Socioeconomic characteristics placed these families generally between food stamp and food distribution families (table 2) with respect to income, food expenditures, family size, and age and education of homemakers.

Eligible nonparticipants were more urban--58 percent--and had more black families --60 percent--than food stamp and ineligible families.

Welfare participation was one of the most notable differences between eligible nonparticipants families and assistance families. About one-third were on welfare, compared with over one-half of food assistance families.

Average family income for eligible nonparticipants was $166, $5 more than for food distribution families. However, their family food expenditures were $10 higher. Even with larger average family size, eligible nonparticipants spent $14 per person for food, compared with $12 per person for food distribution families.

Ineligible Families

Because of higher income and small family size, some families were not eligible for food program participation. They comprised about 28 percent of all EFNEP sample families (table 1). Two-thirds of these families were urban and only 5 percent lived on farms (table 2). This was the only category where less than one-half of the families were black. A relatively large proportion--25 percent--of ineligible families were Spanish American. Only 7 percent were welfare recipients.

The economic situation of ineligible families was markedly better than that of food program participants and eligible nonparticipants. Monthly family income, $320, was nearly double that of food distribution and eligible nonparticipant families. Family and per capita food expenditures were substantially higher than for any other category. Ineligible families reported spending only 29 percent of their income for food, and 55 percent owned their own homes.

Personal characteristics of ineligible homemakers also differed from those of homemakers in the other categories. On the average, they were younger--39 years, compared with 43 for all homemakers--and better educated-- 8.8 years of schooling.

Families Joining and Leaving Food Programs

Characteristics of EFNEP families joining and leaving a food program were based on a subsample of 2,747 families for which data were available over a 6-month period in 1969, which varied according to when families joined EFNEP. Aides obtained information monthly on whether an EFNEP family had joined, stayed with, or dropped out of a food assistance program. Of the subsample of families 1,087 were in a food program at the beginning of the period; 247, or 23 percent, enrolled in a food program; and 102, or 9 percent, discontinued their participation. Thus, a net gain of 14 percent in food programs participation occurred (table 3). 5/ Over the entire period, 1,334 families were served by food programs, which was about 8 percent more than were served at either the beginning or end of the period.

Families who were continuing their food program participation had significantly different socioeconomic characteristics from those enrolling and those leaving. Families joining a food program were over 60 percent urban and over 70 percent black. Six percent of the families joining a food program were Spanish American, compared with 7 percent of those leaving. New participants included more blacks and more urban residents than families with continuous participation. Only 40 percent of those joining were on welfare, compared with 56 percent of those with continuous participation. However, a higher average income also indicated that families who joined a food program during this period were somewhat less needy than those already in a food program.

Forty-four percent of the families leaving a food program were urban and an equal percentage were rural nonfarm. About two-thirds of those leaving were black. Those who dropped out were almost evenly divided between welfare and nonwelfare status.

5/ Some of this gain may have been due to EFNEP efforts.

Table 3–Selected characteristics of EFNEP families participating in a food assistance program at the end of a 6-month period, by food program status, 1969

Characteristic of family or homemaker	Food stamp[1]	Food distribution[1]	Either program[2]	Joined FS/FD[3]	Dropped FS/FD[4]	Neither program[5]
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Residence:						
Urban	47	43	45	63	44	57
Rural nonfarm	39	44	42	31	44	35
Farm	14	13	13	6	12	8
Racial or ethnic group:						
White	33	29	31	22	26	22
Black	61	61	61	72	66	62
Spanish American	5	8	7	6	7	16
Other[6]	—	2	1	—	2	—
Welfare status:						
On welfare	64	52	56	40	48	15
Not on welfare	36	48	44	60	52	85
	Dollars	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*
Monthly family income and food expenditure (averages):						
Income:						
Food reading 1	156	148	151	179	172	226
Food reading 2	168	158	162	176	212	233
Food expenditure:						
Food reading 1	65	56	59	63	65	79
Food reading 2	73	59	63	64	82	80
	Years	*Years*	*Years*	*Years*	*Years*	*Years*
Age of homemaker	44	49	48	45	43	43
Education of homemaker	7.8	7.1	7.3	7.6	7.4	7.9
	Number	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*
Family size	5.9	5.0	5.3	5.4	5.7	4.8
Homemakers reporting	325	660	985	247	102	1,413

— = less than 1 percent. [1] In program at both food readings. [2] In either food stamp or food distribution program at both food readings. [3] Joined either food stamp or food distribution program between food readings. [4] Dropped either food stamp or food distribution between food readings. [5] Were not in a food program at either food reading. [6] Includes American Indians and orientals.

Families leaving and those in a food program over the entire period had similar residence characteristics. Families enrolled in the food program continuously were more often on welfare, had fewer black families, and had lower incomes than those either joining or leaving the program. The average income of joiners decreased over the 6-month period, suggesting that they may have become eligible because of decreased income. In contrast, average income and food expenditures of families leaving increased substantially over the period--a $40 rise in monthly income and a $17 increase in food expenditures. This indicates that a portion of these were dropped because higher incomes made them ineligible to participate.

FAMILY PROFILE BY REGION

About two-thirds of the EFNEP sample families lived in the South (table 4). Consequently, the national profile tended to resemble that of Southern participants.

Program participation was highest in the Northeast, where 46 percent were in a food assistance program. Participation rates in the North Central and Southern States was about the same--35 percent--with lower rates in both the West and Puerto Rico.

The West had the highest proportion of food stamp families--nearly a quarter, compared with one-fifth of the families in the Northeast and North Central States and 12 percent in the South.

Participation in the food distribution program generally exceeded participation in the food stamp program. Approximately 25 percent of the sample families in the Northeast, South, and Puerto Rico were in the food distribution program. Participation in the other regions was less than 15 percent. Program availability in a given region was the major factor contributing to regional variations in the proportion of families participating.

Families eligible but not participating in a food program exceeded 20 percent in all regions except Puerto Rico, which had unique eligibility requirements. 6/

The proportion of ineligibles varied widely by region, ranging from 15 percent in the Northeast to 67 percent in Puerto Rico. More than a third of Western families were not eligible to participate, while about 25 percent of families in North Central and Southern States were ineligibles.

Northeastern families were smallest and had the highest food expenditures of any region, averaging nearly $100 a month per family. Forty-five percent of northeastern families were white, the highest proportion of any region. The North Central region had the highest proportion of families residing in urban areas, 75 percent. The South had the highest proportion of farm families, 11 percent. Average income of Western families was nearly $300, the highest of any region.

FOOD CONSUMPTION PRACTICES

When a homemaker entered EFNEP, her food consumption practices were ascertained from her recall of the number of servings from each of four major food groups (milk, meat, fruit and vegetable, and bread and cereal) she consumed during the previous 24 hours. The homemaker's diet was assumed to be representative of the family's diet. Foods eaten during the day were listed and classified into one of the four major food groups. Each time a food was eaten was counted as a serving. 7/ Food practices were evaluated by comparing number of servings from each food group during the 24-hour period to a serving guide based on USDA's daily food guide. 8/ The serving guide recommends two or more servings from the milk group; two or more from the meat group; four or more from the fruit and vegetable group; and four or more from the bread and cereal group. Such a diet is referred to herein as a 2-2-4-4 diet.

6/ Only 5 percent of Puerto Rican families were classified eligible nonparticipants. Being on welfare was the only requirement for eligibility in Puerto Rico.

7/ Quantities of foods eaten were not obtained.

8/ This measure was based on the minimum number of servings suggested in "Food for Fitness, A Daily Food Guide," U.S. Dept. Agr. Leaflet No. 424. The guide specifies the amount of food constituting a serving in each of the four food groups. An individual serving as reported in this study was not measured and thus may be more than, equal to, or less than the amount specified in the food guide. However, to provide a normative, operational measure for evaluating food consumption practices, it was assumed that reported servings were equivalent, on the average, to those specified in the food guide. In interpreting the findings, this assumption should be recognized.

Table 4—Selected socioeconomic characteristics of EFNEP participants, by region, 1969[1]

Characteristic of family or homemaker	Northeast	North Central	South	West	Puerto Rico
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Residence:					
Urban	67	75	52	47	69
Rural nonfarm	32	20	38	45	31
Farm	2	6	11	8	0
Racial or ethnic group:					
White	46	41	28	35	1
Black	43	53	61	16	0
Spanish American	12	3	10	36	99
Other[2]	0	3	1	13	0
Welfare status:					
On welfare	40	36	31	31	22
Not on welfare	60	64	69	69	78
Families shop primarily at—					
Supermarkets	87	82	69	75	34
Small local stores	11	14	27	23	63
Both	2	3	4	2	2
Food program status:					
Food stamp	21	22	12	24	0
Food distribution	25	13	25	7	26
Nonassistance eligible	22	27	28	19	5
Ineligible	15	24	26	34	67
Nonassistance unclassified	17	13	9	16	2
	Dollars	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*
Monthly family income and food expenditures (average):[3]					
Income	292	283	201	296	144
Per capita	65	53	41	62	29
Food expenditure	98	95	67	95	79
Per capita	22	18	14	20	16
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Income spent for food	34	34	33	32	55
	Years	*Years*	*Years*	*Years*	*Years*
Age of homemaker	40	40	45	40	40
Education of homemaker	9.3	9.3	7.8	9.4	5.3
	Number	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*
Family size	4.5	5.3	4.9	4.8	5.0
Families reporting	865	1,361	5,977	318	510

[1] For States in each region, see definitions in front of report. [2] Includes American Indians and orientals. [3] Income is before tax estimate. Food expenditures do not include values of food from home gardens, donated food, or bonus food stamps.

Food Program Comparisons

At enrollment, only a small proportion--about 5 percent--of homemakers consumed recommended numbers of servings in each food group. Diets were furthest below recommended levels in fruits and vegetables and nearest recommended levels in foods from the meat group (table 5). Nearly 80 percent of homemakers ate the recommended number of servings from the meat group, whereas less than 20 percent ate the recommended number of fruit and vegetable servings.

Table 5–Food consumption practices of homemakers and family characteristics at enrollment in EFNEP, by food program status, 1969

Characteristic of family or homemaker	Assistance		Nonassistance eligible	Ineligible	Total[1]
	Food stamp	Food distribution			
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Food consumption of homemaker (food group servings during 24-hour period):					
Milk, 2 or more	37	35	34	36	35
Meat, 2 or more	75	77	77	84	78
Fruit and vegetable, 4 or more	21	16	18	22	18
Bread and cereal, 4 or more	41	40	38	38	38
4-1-1-1 diet	59	59	57	62	59
2-2-4-4 diet	7	4	4	6	5
	Number	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*
Average servings per homemaker:					
Milk	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.2
Meat	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.7	2.5
Fruit and vegetable	2.2	2.0	2.1	2.4	2.2
Bread and cereal	3.2	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.2
All food groups	9.0	8.9	9.0	9.6	9.1
	Dollars	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*
Monthly family income and food expenditures:					
Income	198	161	166	320	221
Per capita	36	32	32	73	46
Food expenditures	76	59	69	93	76
Per capita	14	12	14	21	16
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Income spent for food	38	37	42	29	34
	Number	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*
Family size	5.5	5.0	5.1	4.4	4.8
Families reporting	1,270	2,031	2,306	2,494	[2]9,424

[1] Proportion or average for all families. [2] Includes those families whose food program status was not determined.

Although only a small proportion of the homemakers in various food assistance categories had 2-2-4-4 diets, some notable differences did exist among them. Ineligibles had average monthly incomes of $320, which was more than $100 above other groups and their average food expenditures were $93, which amounted to at least $17 more than the other groups. Higher expenditures were reflected through a larger number of servings from the meat, milk, and fruit and vegetable groups.

Food stamp homemakers' overall diets ranked second only to those of ineligibles. Although food stamp families' incomes averaged $198 per month, not including bonus food stamps, larger family size resulted in per capita food expenditures equal to those of nonassistance eligibles. Since their per person food expenditures were similar, the better diets of food stamps homemakers probably reflect benefits derived from the food stamp program--that is, food purchased with bonus stamps.

Nonparticipant eligible and food distribution homemakers had the poorest diets. Nonparticipant eligible families had average incomes of only $166 per month, but spent 42 percent of it for food. Spending a large proportion of their incomes for food indicated the attempts of these families to meet their food needs. This was especially evident in their servings from the meat group (which includes dry beans), which exceeded those of food stamp families. Average per capita income of food distribution families was the same as that for nonassistance eligibles, but their per capita food expenditures were 14 percent lower. This suggests some substitution of donated foods for food that would otherwise have been purchased.

Regional Comparisons

In the regional comparisons, all homemakers in a given region were grouped together regardless of food program status (see appendix table 1). Comparisons showed that homemakers in the West had the best diets, followed by those in the North Central States. Homemakers in the Northeastern States had diets inferior to those in the North Central States. Puerto Rican and Southern homemakers had the poorest diets of all; the former were the worse off of the two. There was considerable variation by food program status within regions.

Diets of homemakers by food program status in various regions was generally related to family income and food expenditure. Western homemakers, who had the best diets, also had higher family incomes and higher proportions of food stamp and ineligible families than other regions. However, Western families were slightly below those in the Northeast in per capita food expenditures. Although Northeastern families had the highest food expenditures, they ranked third in terms of overall diets. Families in the South and Puerto Rico had the lowest incomes and food expenditures.

The West was highest in milk consumption and the South was lowest. Puerto Rican homemakers had the highest level of foods from the meat group. Apparently, this is because beans, which when mature are classified in the meat group, are common in the diet of Spanish American families. Northeastern homemakers consumed the least number of serving from this food group, although their families had the highest average incomes.

The West ranked above other regions in fruit and vegetable consumption, in terms of both average servings and percentage of homemakers with four or more servings. This is related in part to their food expenditures, which were relatively high compared with those in some of the other regions. Regions with the lowest income and food expenditures--the South and Puerto Rico--also had the lowest levels of fruit and vegetable consumption. Puerto Rico was the lowest, averaging only 1.4 servings.

Families in the West were highest in the consumption of bread and cereals and Puerto Rican families were the lowest. Relatively high levels of bread and cereal consumption by Southern families probably reflected a substitution for milk and fruit and vegetables, which are extremely low in their diets.

FOOD CONSUMPTION PRACTICES BY SOCIOECONOMIC CHARACTERISTIC

Food consumption practices by socioeconomic characteristics were compared for various family groupings (see appendix tables 2-6). In general, homemakers of EFNEP farm families had better consumption practices than urban homemakers. The percentage of food distribution homemakers in urban areas eating recommended amounts of fruits and vegetables and bread/cereal was particularly low. In part, the better diets of the farm people reflect the increased availability of fruits and vegetables in farming areas during the gardening season, although farm families typically had lower incomes.

There was a positive relationship between diets and education, particularly among those families not in a food program. This indicates that the food programs were able to raise diets above levels that would have existed in the absence of the program. Generally, a more consistent relationship existed between education and fruit-vegetables than for the other food groups.

Typically, Indians had better diets, higher incomes, and higher food expenditures than other ethnic groups. Spanish Americans sometimes had very poor diet particularly in the case of food distribution homemakers. However, their poor diets seemed to be associated or caused by low incomes. Blacks also often had low incomes, low food expenditures, and poor diets, particularly with respect to the milk group. Whites were usually between the other ethnic groups with respect to income, food expenditures, and diet. However, they tended to have smaller families.

An association between income, food expenditures, and food consumption was evident among families not participating in a food program, particularly in the case of fruits and vegetables. For food program participants, the income and food expenditure estimates did not include the value of bonus stamps or the value of donated foods The relative absence of an association between income/food expenditures and consumption for food assistance families is partly because the food programs tend to raise the consumption levels of the families with limited purchasing power.

Change in Food Consumption Practices

Food consumption practices of a subgroup of 2,843 homemakers after 6 months' participation in EFNEP were compared with their practices when they entered the program. 9/ Substantial progress was indicated in terms of increases in both the number of homemakers with recommended levels and the average number of servings for each food group. Most improvement in consumption was made in food groups initially most deficient in the diet-milk and fruits and vegetables. Homemakers with low initial consumption levels showed the greatest progress.

Homemakers in each category improved over the 6-month period, including those who joined a food program after they enrolled in EFNEP (table 6). All categories showed an increase of more than 5 percent in homemakers with 2-2-4-4 diets. However, those joining a food program made more relative progress, since only 2 percent of them had a 2-2-4-4 diet upon enrollment, compared with 4 percent or more of homemakers in other categories. The number of food stamp homemakers and those joining a program who began to use recommended servings of the milk and bread and cereal groups substantially increased. Food stamp homemakers with two or more servings of the meat group increased greatly.

FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH INCOME AND FOOD EXPENDITURES

In formulating programs to improve the economic well-being of low-income families, it is important to know as much as possible regarding the socioeconomic characteristics of families with various income and food expenditure levels. This knowledge can be used to identify factors associated with income levels and to estimate probable effects of programs designed to raise income and food expenditures. For example, by knowing the income-food expenditure relationship, probable effects on food expenditures of raising incomes of low-income families can be estimated. This study examines income and food expenditure relationships using the technique of multiple regression.

9/ For more detailed information on changes in food consumption practices, see Feaster, J. Gerald. Impact of the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program on Low-Income Families: An Indepth Analysis, U.S. Dept. Agr., Agr. Econ. Rpt. No. 220. 73 pp. Feb. 1972.

Table 6—Initial, 6-month, and change in food consumption practices and food knowledge of EFNEP homemakers, by food program status, 1969[1]

Item	Food stamp			Food distribution			Joined food program[2]			No participation		
	Food reading		Change	Food reading		Change	Food reading		Change	Food reading		Change
	1	2		1	2		1	2		1	2	
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Homemakers reporting servings:												
Milk group, 2 or more	32	47	15	38	47	9	28	48	20	33	46	13
Meat group, 2 or more	70	84	14	74	82	8	75	81	6	78	84	6
Fruit and vegetable group, 4 or more	15	28	13	14	29	15	13	29	16	15	28	13
Bread and cereal group, 4 or more	37	53	16	43	54	11	36	52	16	35	45	10
1 or more, each food group	50	70	20	61	72	11	56	73	17	57	72	15
2 or more each, milk and meat and 4 or more each, fruit and vegetable and bread and cereal	7	13	6	4	11	7	2	9	7	4	10	6
	Dollars	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*
Average monthly family income and food expenditures[3]												
Income	156	168	12	148	158	10	179	176	-3	226	233	7
Food expenditures	65	73	8	56	59	3	63	64	1	79	80	1
Per capita	11.0	12.4	1.4	11.2	11.8	.6	11.7	11.9	.2	16.5	16.7	.2
	Percent	*Percent*		*Percent*	*Percent*		*Percent*	*Percent*		*Percent*	*Percent*	
Income spent for food	42	43		38	37		35	36		35	34	
	Number	*Number*		*Number*	*Number*		*Number*	*Number*		*Number*	*Number*	
Family size	5.9			5.0			5.4			4.8		
Homemakers reporting[4]		325			660			247			1,413	

[1] Based on sample of 2,843 EFNEP homemakers. [2] Was not participating in a U.S. food program at the time of food reading 1, but was enrolled in either the food stamp or food distribution programs at food reading 2. [3] Income is before tax estimate. Food expenditures do not include values of foods from home gardens, donated foods, or value of bonus food stamps. [4] Does not include families that left a food program between food readings and those not reporting food reading dates.

Included in data available on EFNEP sample families were factors hypothesized to be associated with food expenditures. Among these were income, age and education of homemakers, residence, geographical region, and welfare status. These same factors, except income, were also assumed to be associated with income levels. Multiple regression analyses were used to sort out effects of individual factors on food expenditures.

In the regression models, food expenditure and income were dependent variables. Two basic models were hypothesized and formulated. They were tested, using data on the four groups of families in the EFNEP sample. Only family records that had information on each of the variables were included in the regression analyses. Puerto Rican records were excluded because of their dissimilarity with those of the mainland.

Equations included in this chapter have been used to examine the effect of both quantative and qualitative factors on family income and food expenditures. Qualitative factors were incorporated through the use of zero-one or dummy variables, where for each observation the dummy variables are equal to either one or zero. The general model used assumes independence of the dummy variables. (See appendix tables 19-23 for correlation matrices.)

One variable from each group of dummies was omitted. "It is completely arbitrary which dummy variable from each set is eliminated from the model--the interpretation of individual coefficients differs but the basic information obtained does not." 10/ The omitted variable serves as a base from which the other dummy variables are evaluated. A sufficiently large number of observations should be contained in the omitted category to provide an adequate comparative base. For the regional variables the South was omitted, for the race variables, whites were omitted, for the residence variables, rural nonfarm was omitted, for the welfare variable, on welfare was omitted. In interpreting the results, the value of the regression coefficient of the dummy variable shows the effect of that characteristic on the dependent variable relative to the omitted category. Two groups of equations are discussed. The first group has food expenditures as the dependent variable and the second group, monthly family income.

Family Food Expenditure Models

Factors included in regression equations fitted for food expenditure and income data accounted for one-fourth to one-half of the variation in food expenditures. The analysis indicated that two variables were consistently highly significant in each equation in their relations to family food expenditures (table 7): family size and monthly family income.

Four models were used which had monthly family food expenditures as the dependent variable. Equation I was fitted for food stamp families, equation II for food distribution families, equation III for nonassistance eligibles, and equation IV for ineligibles. In addition to coefficients for the respective independent variables, the standard error and computed "t" value for each coefficient are given. Also, the coefficient of determination is provided for each equation.

Food Stamp Families.--The coefficient of determination (R^2) for equation I indicated that more than one-half of the variation in food expenditures of food stamp families was explained by the equation. Signs of all the coefficients were as hypothesized except for homemaker education. This may be explained by the relationship of education to other independent variables, particularly income. Education is an important determinant of income.

10/ Hallberg, Milton C., Statistical Analysis of Single Equation Stochastic Models Using the Digital Computer, AE and R.S. 78, Agricultural Experiment Station, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Feb. 1969.

Table 7.–Values of coefficients in multiple regression equations for monthly food expenditures by EFNEP families, by food program status, 1969[1]

Dependent variable	Constant	Independent variable						
		Age	Family size	Education (years)	Black[2]	Spanish American[2]	Northeast[2]	North Central[2]
Monthly food expenditure of assistance families:								
I. Food stamp–								
Coefficient	6.26	-0.02	4.27**	-0.027	-7.55**	0.25	0.16	5.97
Standard error		(.096)	(.483)	(.539)	(2.677)	(6.935)	(4.308)	(4.175)
Computed "t" value		.21	8.85	.05	2.82	.04	.04	1.43
II. Food distribution–								
Coefficient	7.23	-0.16*	2.02**	.37	-3.03	6.89	13.77**	12.52**
Standard error		(.067)	(.39)	(.36)	(2.00)	(4.98)	(3.26)	(2.97)
Computed "t" value		2.39	5.18	1.04	1.51	1.38	4.22	4.22
Monthly food expenditure of nonassistance families:								
III. Eligible–								
Coefficient	15.62	-0.08	3.01**	-.61	-4.14*	-.32	15.05**	4.42
Standard error		(0.061)	(0.395)	(0.345)	(1.982)	(3.858)	(3.743)	(2.865)
Computed "t" value		1.31	7.63	1.77	2.09	.08	4.02	1.54
IV. Ineligible–								
Coefficient	12.37	.14	7.48**	.02	-3.98	.74	20.53**	13.77**
Standard error		(.09)	(.65)	(.47)	(2.71)	(4.28)	(5.37)	(3.79)
Computed "t" value		1.56	11.51	.04	1.47	.17	3.82	3.63

See footnotes at end of table.

Continued

Table 7.—Values of coefficients in multiple regression equations for monthly food expenditures by EFNEP families, by food program status, 1969[1] —Continued

Dependent variable	Independent variable						R^2
	West[2]	Urban[2]	Farm[2]	Non-welfare[2]	Monthly income	Monthly income square	
Monthly food expenditure of assistance families:							
I. Food stamp–							
Coefficient	12.31	0.36	-2.39	-1.08	0.29**	-0.00017**	0.51
Standard error	(7.103)	(2.845)	(3.992)	(2.656)	(.034)	(.00006)	
Computed "t" value	1.73	.13	.60	.41	8.53	2.83	
II. Food distribution–							
Coefficient	5.42	-3.26	3.27	-.34	.33**	-.00025**	.48
Standard error	(29.48)	(2.03)	(2.92)	(1.84)	(.03)	(.00005)	
Computed "t" value	.18	1.61	1.12	.18	11.00	5.00	
Monthly food expenditure of nonassistance families:							
III. Eligible–							
Coefficient	9.30	-7.73**	-6.01*	5.38**	.30**	-.00007	.51
Standard error	(5.753)	(1.932)	(3.018)	(1.931)	(.034)	(.00008)	
Computed "t" value	1.62	4.00	1.99	2.79	8.82	.87	
IV. Ineligible–							
Coefficient	11.33	-4.05	- 8.86	6.73	.11**	-.00002	.27
Standard error	(6.04)	(2.69)	(5.28)	(4.57)	(.04)	(.00005)	
Computed "t" value	1.87	1.50	1.68	1.47	2.75	.40	

*Statistically significant at the 0.05 level.
**Statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

[1] Data from the following number of families were used in fitting the equations: equation I, 710; equation II, 1,087; equation III, 1,390; and equation IV, 1,402. [2] In setting up dummy variable, it is necessary to omit 1 category for each characteristic. The omitted category then becomes the base for comparison. White, South, rural nonfarm, and welfare participation were omitted.

Four of the thirteen variables were highly significant at the 0.01 level. 11/ These were family size, the dummy variable for blacks, monthly income, and monthly income squared. Family size and income variables were, significant at the 0.01 confidence level in each of the four equations. Typical food stamp families would be expected to spend an average of $4.27 per month for food for each additional family member. This was more than for either food distribution or nonassistance eligible families, but was considerably below the $7.48 spent for each additional family member by ineligible families. 12/ The analysis showed that black food stamp families spent an average of $7.55 less per month than whites.

There was a positive relationship between income and family food expenditures. Signs of the income with coefficients indicated that the effect of income on expenditures was greater at lower income levels. With a monthly family income of $200, $0.22 per $1 increase in monthly income would be spent on food by typical food stamp families.

Food Distribution Families.--The equation for food distribution families explained slightly less than half the variation in their monthly family food expenditures. Considering the myriad factors contributing to variations in family food expenditures, the model provides a relatively good explanation of variations in expenditures. On the basis of the computed "t" value, monthly family income appeared to be an important factor contributing to variations in family food expenditures. Based on this equation, a $1 increase in income would be expected to increase food expenditures $0.23 for food distribution families with monthly incomes of $200.

Coefficients for both the Northeast and North Central dummy variables were positive and highly significant. This indicates that expenditures in these two regions were significantly higher than the South. One other coefficient--age of homemaker--was significant at the 0.05 level. The negative sign denoted an inverse relationship between homemaker's age and family food expenditures.

Nonparticipating Eligible Families.--The equation for nonparticipating eligible families accounted for more than half the variation in family food expenditures. Five variables were highly significant, and two others were significant at the 0.05 level. Income was an important variable with a $1 increase in income resulting in increased food expenditures of $0.27 at an income level of $200 per month. Other significant variables--family size, residence in the Northeast, and nonwelfare--exerted a positive influence on food expenditures. Signs of the coefficients indicated that eligible black families and urban families would be expected to spend less for food than those in other categories.

Ineligible Families.--The coefficient of determination for equation IV indicated that less than 30 percent of the variation in food expenditures for ineligible families was explained. This was expected because ineligible families had substantially higher average family incomes. At such levels, more discretionary income is generally available, which may be used either for food or nonfood items. Hence, a larger array of nonquantifiable factors and influences would enter a family's food expenditure decision making matrix.

11/ A 0.01 confidence level indicates that the chances are less than 1 in 100 that the independent variable(s) has no effect on the dependent variable (food expenditures in this case). Variables with a confidence level of 0.01 will be called "highly significant"; variables with confidence levels of 0.05 (less than 5 chances in 100) will be called significant.

12/ These models assume a constant relationship between family size and food expenditure. The coefficients are most applicable near the mean. They do not necessarily hold for extreme values. Some economies of scale may exist with respect to family size and food expenditures.

Family size was a highly significant explanatory variable. An additional $7.48 would be spent for each extra family member. Families in the Northeastern, North Central, and Western Regions would be expected to spend more for food than those in the South. Typical ineligible families would be expected to spend about $0.10 of each $1 increase in income for food at income levels of $200. Apparently, these higher income families are located farther out on a hypothesized income-food expenditure hyperbola than families in the other food program categories and have little motivation to buy more food. This being true, EFNEP should encourage these families to redirect food dollars toward a 2-2-4-4 diet rather than encourage additional expenditures.

Income-Food Expenditure Relationships

It was hypothesized that larger increases in food expenditures would result from additional income at lower income levels than at higher levels. Since diminishing utility was assumed, a quadratic function was used in the analysis. Income coefficients had the expected signs and were highly significant at the 0.01 levels. Marginal propensities to make food expenditures by food program status at selected income levels are shown in table 8. Other variables in the equation are assumed to be held constant at their respective means.

Each of the four sample groups showed increases in food expenditures at the income levels shown. However, nonparticipating eligible families showed the largest response. For example, with an income of $200, a $1 increase would result in a $0.27 increase in food expenditures by eligible families. This compares with average increases of $0.22 for food stamp families, $0.23 for food distribution families, and only $0.10 for ineligible families. The values of bonus food stamps and donated foods were not included as income or as food expenditures in the analysis.

Nonparticipating eligible families, according to this analysis, spend more than one-fourth of each additional dollar of income for food (table 8). This substantial

Table 8--Estimated increase in food expenditures for each $1 increase in income at selected income levels, by food program status, 1969 1/

Monthly income level (dollars)	Food stamp 2/	Food distribution 3/	Non-assistance eligible	Ineligible
	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars
100	0.26	0.28	0.29	4/
150	.24	.25	.28	4/
200	.22	.23	.27	0.10
250	.21	.21	.26	.10
300	.19	.18	.26	.10
350	.17	4/	4/	.10
400	4/	4/	4/	.09

1/ Estimated from equations I, II, III, and IV in table 7.
2/ The value of food stamps was not included as income or as food expenditure in the analysis.
3/ The value of donated foods was not included as income or as food expenditure in the analysis.
4/ Was not estimated for these income levels since only a few families in the respective food groups had incomes at these levels.

increase in food expenditures in response to increased income is not surprising, considering that: (1) they are not receiving supplementary benefits from a food program, and (2) they are in need of food as evidence by their eligibility for a food program.

The low responsiveness, in terms of increased food expenditures, of ineligible families to income increases--only 10 percent of each additional dollar of income was spent on food--is also understandable. Although these are relatively low-income families, they had incomes sufficiently large or family sizes sufficiently small to make them ineligible for a food program. The analysis supports the hypothesis that ineligible families were able to purchase enough food to satisfy what they considered to be their basic food needs. About 90 percent of additional income went for nonfood expenditures. These families were not necessarily getting enough food or the right kinds, but they were getting enough food to meet their felt requirements and did not feel compelled to spend much additional income for food.

Family Income Models

To identify factors associated with family income, four models were fitted with monthly family income as the dependent variables (table 9). Equations V, VI, VII, and VIII were fitted for food stamp, food distribution, nonparticipating eligibles, and ineligible families, respectively. The same independent variables, except income, were included in the income models as in the food expenditure models. Generally, there were more significant variables in the income models. However, the variation explained was somewhat lower for some of the income equations than for the corresponding food expenditure models. In most instances, family size, homemakers' education, race, region of residence and welfare status were significantly associated with income levels, while age did not appear to be.

Food Stamp Families.--Equation V shows that nearly one-half--49 percent--of the variation in family income was explained by the 11 independent variables. This is a relatively large proportion, considering the many objective and subjective factors that affect income levels. Eight of the 11 variables were highly significant (0.01 level). For each additional person in a food stamp family, monthly income increased more than $10, and for each year of education completed by the homemaker, income rose more than $5. Blacks' incomes averaged about $21 less than whites.

Monthly incomes among food stamp families varied widely by region. Northeastern families had $159 more income than Southern families; North Central families had $111 more; and Western, $54 more. Income patterns of urban and rural nonfarm families did not differ signficantly. However, farm families averaged about $34 less income than rural nonfarm families. Nonwelfare families in the food stamp program had about $45 more income a month than welfare families.

Food Distribution Families.--Independent variables in equation VI explained slightly more than a quarter of the variation in incomes of food distribution families. Five variables were significant at the 0.01 level and three at the 0.05 level. Family size and education were positively related to income. For each additional family member, income increased more than $13 on the average, and for each year of homemaker education, income increased about $3.50.

Blacks had about $12 less income than whites, but Spanish American incomes were not significantly different from those of white families at the 0.05 confidence level. Northeastern and North Central families had higher incomes than Southern families; however, differences among regions were not as large as they were for food stamp families. Food distribution families in the Northeast and North Central States had about $42 and $25 more, respectively, than Southern families. Incomes of Western families were not significantly different from those in the South. Incomes of urban

Table 9.—Values of coefficients in multiple regression equations for monthly incomes of EFNEP families by food program status, 1969[1]

Dependent variable	Cor stant	Independent variable				
		Age	Family size	Education (years)	Black[2]	Spanish American[2]
Monthly income of assistance families:						
V. Food stamp–						
Coefficient	52.95	-0.23	10.69**	5.26**	-20.81**	7.64
Standard error		(.273)	(1.303)	(1.525)	(7.595)	(19.820)
Computed "t" value		.84	8.20	3.45	2.74	.39
VI. Food distribution–						
Coefficient	71.00	-.22	13.34**	3.54**	-12.10*	19.77
Standard error		(.189)	(1.028)	(1.016)	(5.680)	(14.172)
Computed "t" value		1.16	12.98	3.48	2.13	1.40
Monthly income of nonassistance families:						
VII. Eligible–						
Coefficient	47.51	-.06	17.10**	2.62**	-22.03**	-.924
Standard error		(.119)	(.627)	(.679)	(3.880)	(7.632)
Computed "t" value		.50	27.27	3.86	5.68	1.21
VIII. Ineligible–						
Coefficient	125.78	-.39	23.09**	7.10**	-17.14**	-11.55
Standard error		(.222)	(1.379)	(1.127)	(6.525)	(10.324)
Computed "t" value		1.76	16.75	6.30	2.63	1.12

See footnotes at end of table.

Continued

Table 9.—Values of coefficients in multiple regression equations for monthly incomes of EFNEP families, by food program status, 1969[1] —Continued

Dependent variable	Independent variable						R^2
	Northeast[2]	North Central[2]	West[2]	Urban[2]	Farm[2]	Nonwelfare[2]	
Monthly income of assistance families:							
V. Food stamp–							
Coefficient	159.13**	111.03**	53.53**	-3.09	-33.72**	44.88**	.49
Standard error	(10.740)	(11.004)	(20.095)	(8.130)	(11.327)	(7.391)	
Computed "t" value	14.82	10.09	2.66	.38	2.98	6.07	
VI. Food distribution–							
Coefficient	41.72**	24.80**	-15.24	19.00**	-20.80*	12.76*	.26
Standard error	(9.214)	(8.410)	(84.002)	(5.740)	(8.291)	(5.220)	
Computed "t" value	4.53	2.95	.18	3.31	2.51	2.44	
Monthly income of nonassistance families:							
VII. Eligible–							
Coefficient	83.70**	60.56**	43.21**	10.81**	-21.06**	9.16*	.50
Standard error	(6.993)	(5.409)	(11.337)	(3.816)	(5.949)	(3.816)	
Computed "t" value	11.97	11.20	3.81	2.83	3.54	2.40	
VIII. Ineligible–							
Coefficient	107.26**	81.53**	76.80**	3.80	4.59	63.99**	.34
Standard error	(12.652)	(8.863)	(14.463)	(6.488)	(12.759)	(10.823)	
Computed "t" value	8.48	9.20	5.31	.59	.36	5.91	

*Statistically significant at the 0.05 level.
**Statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

[1] Data from the following number of families were used in fitting the equations: equation V, 710; equation VI, 1,087; equation VII, 1,390; and equation VIII, 1,402. [2] In setting up dummy variables it is necessary to omit 1 category for each characteristic. The omitted category then becomes the base for comparison. White, South, rural nonfarm, and welfare participation were omitted.

families were about $19 larger than those of rural nonfarm families, and farm incomes were approximately $21 less than rural nonfarm incomes. Nonwelfare families generally had about $13 more income than welfare families.

Nonassistance Eligible Families.--The variables in equation VII explained one-half of the variation in monthly income of nonparticipating eligible families. Eight independent variables were significant at the 0.01 level and one at the 0.05 level. Family size was positively associated with income at the rate of about $17 per member. For each additional year of homemaker education, family income increased by approximately $2.60. Blacks had about $22 less income a month than whites, but the difference between the incomes of Spanish Americans and whites was not significant at the 0.05 level.

Families from the non-Southern regions had significantly larger incomes than Southern families, at average rates of $84, $61, and $43 per month for the Northeastern, North Central, and Western Regions, respectively. Income also differed significantly by place of residence. Urban families had about $11 more income than rural nonfarm, and farm families had about $21 less income than rural nonfarm families. Thus, urban families on the average had $32 more income than farm families. Nonwelfare families had about $9 more income than welfare families.

Ineligible Families.--Independent variables in equation VIII explained about one-third of the variation in monthly incomes of ineligible families. Seven independent variables were significant at the 0.01 level. The effect of family size was exceptionally large; each additional family member was associated with an increase of $23 in family income. The education effect was also large-each additional year of homemaker education was associated with a $17 increase in monthly family income. Blacks' monthly incomes were about $17 less than those of whites, but incomes of whites and Spanish Americans were not significantly different at the 0.05 level.

There were some rather large and significant differences in incomes of families in the various regions. Families in all non-Southern regions had significantly higher incomes than Southern families. Northeastern families had an average of $107 more; North Central, $82 more; and Western families, $77. Incomes of ineligible families did not vary significantly by place of residence or by age of homemaker. However, nonwelfare families had significantly more income than welfare families--$64 more per month.

Table A-1—Characteristics of EFNEP participating families, by food program status and geographical region, 1969

Characteristic of family or homemaker	Food stamp families[1]				Food distribution families				
	Northeast	North Central	South	West	Northeast	North Central	South	West	Puerto Rico
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Residence:									
Urban	61	78	39	37	46	60	45	19	77
Rural nonfarm	35	20	42	54	53	25	43	81	23
Farm	4	2	18	10	2	14	13	0	0
Racial or ethnic group:									
White	58	40	36	17	70	44	29	24	0
Black	37	52	62	21	18	52	63	0	0
Spanish American	5	1	2	62	11	2	6	0	100
Other[2]	0	6	0	0	0	2	2	76	0
Welfare status:									
On welfare	42	75	56	60	60	45	51	55	63
Not on welfare	58	25	44	40	40	55	49	45	37
	Dollars	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*
Monthly family income and food expenditures:									
Income	323	254	142	196	227	208	155	221	95
Per capita	62	47	25	46	53	35	32	30	17
Food expenditures	99	95	61	85	85	78	54	58	58
Per capita	19	18	11	20	20	13	11	8	10
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Income spent for food	31	37	43	43	37	38	35	26	61
	Years	*Years*	*Years*	*Years*	*Years*	*Years*	*Years*	*Years*	*Years*
Age of homemaker	37	38	45	42	45	42	48	45	40
Education of homemaker	10.1	9.4	7.2	8.5	9.0	8.0	7.4	7.9	4.5
	Number	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*
Family size	5.2	5.4	5.7	4.3	4.3	5.9	4.9	7.3	5.6
Families reporting	179	300	718	77	220	180	1,485	21	131

See footnotes at end of table.

Continued

Table A-1–Characteristics of EFNEP participating families, by food program status and geographical region, 1969–Continued

Characteristic of family or homemaker	Nonassistance eligible					Ineligible				
	Northeast	North Central	South	West	Puerto Rico	Northeast	North Central	South	West	Puerto Rico
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Residence:										
Urban	80	75	51	49	62	70	77	62	60	67
Rural nonfarm	20	20	38	44	38	30	18	33	30	33
Farm	0	5	11	7	0	1	4	6	9	0
Racial or ethnic group:										
White	33	40	25	29	0	38	46	31	45	2
Black	52	54	64	17	0	44	47	54	19	0
Spanish American	16	3	10	39	100	17	4	14	32	98
Other[2]	0	3	0	16	0	1	2	1	4	0
Welfare status:										
On welfare	47	36	29	42	100	11	8	8	7	0
Not on welfare	53	64	71	58	0	89	92	92	93	100
	Dollars	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*
Monthly family income and food expenditures:										
Income	239	229	144	186	86	409	403	321	428	168
Per capita	52	41	28	39	15	100	91	75	93	36
Food expenditures	94	89	62	79	58	120	112	86	116	89
Per capita	20	16	12	16	10	29	25	20	25	19
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Income spent for food	39	39	43	42	67	29	28	27	27	53
	Years	*Years*	*Years*	*Years*	*Years*	*Years*	*Years*	*Years*	*Years*	*Years*
Age of homemaker	39	42	46	45	41	38	38	40	34	40
Education of homemaker	8.3	9.0	7.4	9.2	5.5	10.1	10.1	8.9	10.5	5.6
	Number	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*
Family size	4.6	5.6	5.1	4.8	5.8	4.1	4.4	4.3	4.6	4.7
Families reporting	191	370	1,658	60	27	133	334	1,578	109	340

[1] The food stamp program was not available in Puerto Rico during the period covered by this study. [2] Includes American Indians and orientals.

Table A-2—Selected socioeconomic characteristics of EFNEP families, by region, 1969

Characteristic of family or homemaker	Unit	Northeast	North Central	South	West	Puerto Rico	Total[1]
Family or homemaker:							
Number in family	Number	4.5	5.3	4.9	4.8	5.0	4.8
Children 19 and under	do.	2.9	3.6	3.0	2.9	2.8	3.0
Children in school	do.	1.8	2.5	1.9	2.0	1.6	1.9
Children in school lunch	do.	.9	1.6	1.3	1.3	.8	1.2
Age of homemaker	Years	40	40	45	40	40	43
Education of homemaker	do.	9.3	9.2	7.8	9.4	5.3	8.0
Food consumption of homemaker (food group servings during 24 hours):							
Milk, 2 or more	Percent	41	43	31	45	44	35
Meat, 2 or more	do.	75	78	79	76	86	78
Fruit and vegetable, 4 or more	do.	23	24	16	39	7	18
Bread and cereal, 4 or more	do.	34	38	41	43	16	38
1-1-1-1 diet	do.	64	65	56	69	60	59
2-2-4-4 diet	do.	6	8	4	12	2	5
Average servings:							
Milk	Servings	1.4	1.5	1.1	1.6	1.5	1.2
Meat	do.	2.2	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.7	2.5
Fruit and vegetable	do.	2.4	2.5	2.1	3.1	1.4	2.2
Bread and cereal	do.	3.0	3.2	3.3	3.4	2.6	3.2
Total	do.	9.0	9.6	9.0	10.6	8.2	9.1
Family food program status:[2]							
Food Stamp	Percent	25	25	13	29	([3])	15
Food distribution	do.	30	15	27	8	26	2[illegible]
Nonassistance eligible	do.	26	31	30	22	5	2[illegible]
Ineligible	do.	18	28	29	41	68	[illegible]1
Monthly family income and food expenditures:							
Income	Dollars	292	283	201	296	144	221
Per capita	do.	65	53	41	62	29	46
Food expenditures	do.	98	95	67	96	79	76
Per capita	do.	22	18	14	20	16	16
Income spent for food	Percent	34	34	33	32	55	34
Families reporting	Number	723	1,184	5,439	267	498	[4]9,424

[1] Proportion or average for all families. [2] Expressed as a centage of those for which food program status was determined. [3] Puerto Rico had no food stamp program. [4] Includes families for which food program status was not determined.

Table A-3—Food consumption practices of EFNEP homemakers and family characteristics, by food program status and region, 1969

Characteristic of family or homemaker	Northeast				North Central			
	Assistance		Nonassistance		Assistance		Nonassistance	
	Food stamp	Food distribution	Eligible	Ineligible	Food stamp	Food distribution	Eligible	Ineligible
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Food consumption of homemaker (food group servings during 24-hour period):								
Milk, 2 or more	43	36	44	41	45	35	41	50
Meat, 2 or more	76	66	75	78	77	73	78	82
Fruit and vegetable, 4 or more	28	13	28	32	25	19	21	35
Bread and cereal, 4 or more	31	29	43	35	40	43	37	40
1-1-1-1 diet	66	56	69	65	66	59	65	74
2-2-4-4 diet	4	3	11	8	10	6	6	10
	Number	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*
Average servings per homemaker:								
Milk	1.4	1.2	1.5	1.4	1.5	1.2	1.4	1.6
Meat	2.3	1.9	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.5
Fruit and vegetable	2.6	2.0	2.5	2.9	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.9
Bread and cereal	2.9	2.8	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.4	3.1	3.3
Total	9.2	7.9	9.6	9.9	9.5	9.2	9.1	10.3
	Dollars	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*
Monthly family income and food expenditures:								
Income	323	227	239	409	254	208	229	402
Per capita	62	53	52	100	47	35	41	91
Food expenditure	99	85	94	120	95	78	89	112
Per capita	19	20	20	29	18	13	16	25
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Income spent for food	31	37	39	29	37	38	39	28
	Number	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*
Family size	5.2	4.3	4.6	4.1	5.4	5.9	5.6	4.4
Families reporting	179	220	191	133	300	180	370	334

—Continued

Table A-3–Food consumption practices of EFNEP homemakers and family characteristics, by food program status and region, 1969–Continued

Characteristic of family or homemaker	South				West			
	Assistance		Nonassistance		Assistance		Nonassistance	
	Food stamp	Food distribution	Eligible	Ineligible	Food stamp	Food distribution	Eligible	Ineligible
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Food consumption of homemaker (food group servings during 24-hour period):								
Milk, 2 or more	28	34	30	32	60	14	44	45
Meat, 2 or more	73	79	77	84	82	76	73	76
Fruit and vegetable, 4 or more	15	17	15	20	42	33	37	45
Bread and cereal, 4 or more	42	44	38	42	52	29	43	49
1-1-1-1 diet	52	60	54	59	75	52	63	75
2-2-4-4 diet	4	5	3	6	21	0	15	10
	Number	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*
Average servings per homemaker:								
Milk	1.0	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.9	.9	1.4	1.6
Meat	2.3	2.5	2.5	2.7	2.7	2.3	2.4	2.6
Fruit and vegetable	2.0	2.1	2.0	2.3	3.0	2.7	2.9	3.3
Bread and cereal	3.3	3.4	3.2	3.3	3.5	2.9	3.3	3.5
Total	8.6	9.2	8.8	9.4	11.1	8.8	10.0	11.0
	Dollars	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*
Monthly family income and food expenditures:								
Income	142	155	144	321	196	221	186	428
Per capita	25	32	28	75	46	30	39	93
Food expenditure	61	54	62	86	85	58	79	116
Per capita	11	11	12	20	20	8	16	25
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Income spent for food	43	35	43	27	43	26	42	27
	Number	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*
Family size	5.7	4.9	5.1	4.3	4.3	7.3	4.8	4.6
Families reporting	718	1,485	1,658	1,578	77	21	60	109

Table A-4—Food consumption practices, family income and food expenditures, and family size, EFNEP families, by food program status and residence, 1969

Food program and residence	Homemakers with food group servings during 24-hour period of—						Percentage of families with—			
	Milk, 2 or more	Meat, 2 or more	Fruit and vegetable, 4 or more	Bread and cereal, 4 or more	1-1-1-1 diet	2-2-4-4 diet	Monthly family income of $200 or more	Monthly family food expenditure of $85 or more	5 members or more	Families reporting
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Number*
Food stamp:										
Urban	36	76	21	37	57	6	50	39	58	615
Rural nonfarm	36	73	20	41	58	8	39	35	54	446
Farm	37	78	21	54	62	7	26	25	68	142
Food distribution:										
Urban	33	75	12	36	56	3	35	22	50	926
Rural nonfarm	38	78	17	45	60	5	32	20	50	791
Farm	35	78	28	47	63	10	27	21	64	209
Nonassistance eligible:										
Urban	34	77	16	39	58	4	39	30	55	1,268
Rural nonfarm	33	76	20	36	56	5	33	28	51	739
Farm	32	82	22	42	59	6	29	23	57	197
Ineligible:										
Urban	38	84	21	38	62	6	83	49	41	1,548
Rural nonfarm	33	86	22	39	62	6	86	52	43	728
Farm	38	84	37	46	66	8	95	49	40	113

Table A-5—Food consumption practices, family income and food expenditures, and family size, EFNEP families, by food program status and education, 1969

Food program and education of homemaker	Homemakers with food group servings during 24-hour period of—						Percentage of families with—			Families reporting
	Milk, 2 or more	Meat, 2 or more	Fruit and vegetable, 4 or more	Bread and cereal, 4 or more	1-1-1-1 diet	2-2-4-4 diet	Monthly family income of $200 or more	Monthly family food expenditure of $85 or more	5 members or more	
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Number*
Food stamp:										
No education	21	65	14	7	57	0	17	8	50	14
1-3 years	33	79	12	31	50	4	21	23	43	68
4-7	25	73	18	44	51	5	26	24	54	328
8-11	40	78	23	42	63	9	48	42	63	532
12 or more	43	74	24	42	65	4	74	49	60	183
Food distribution:										
No education	29	69	3	29	48	0	17	5	52	62
1-3 years	38	76	19	38	55	5	29	14	45	181
4-7	37	78	17	41	58	4	30	18	47	639
8-11	33	77	15	40	61	4	40	25	59	719
12 or more	38	80	21	45	62	6	44	34	50	194
Nonassistance eligible:										
No education	18	71	7	26	34	1	29	13	53	73
1-3 years	33	71	14	37	48	2	22	25	40	167
4-7	31	78	16	37	54	2	26	23	48	672
8-11	34	76	20	39	60	6	44	34	61	838
12 or more	43	79	20	44	72	7	53	37	61	241
Ineligible:										
No education	36	84	3	33	56	3	60	48	41	63
1-3 years	34	83	12	25	52	3	61	41	37	156
4-7	32	86	18	33	57	6	74	46	39	535
8-11	36	84	23	40	64	6	90	50	43	865
12 or more	40	84	30	44	68	8	96	54	42	566

Table A-6—Food consumption practices, family income and food expenditures, and family size, EFNEP families by food program status and ethnic group, 1969

Food program and racial or ethnic group	Homemakers with food group servings during 24-hour period of—						Percentage of families with—			Families reporting
	Milk, 2 or more	Meat, 2 or more	Fruit and vegetable, 4 or more	Bread and cereal, 4 or more	1-1-1-1 diet	2-2-4-4 diet	Monthly family income of $200 or more	Monthly family food expenditure of $85 or more	5 members or more	
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Number*
Food stamp:										
White	40	73	26	38	58	5	45	38	51	492
Black	31	74	14	41	56	5	39	31	62	673
Spanish American	52	88	39	51	76	19	56	45	59	80
Indian	69	95	47	68	90	42	79	79	63	19
Food distribution:										
White	36	73	19	42	59	5	34	23	42	648
Black	35	79	16	42	80	5	31	18	53	1,044
Spanish American	38	82	5	30	52	1	28	26	63	240
Indian	23	81	20	37	61	4	60	40	67	54
Nonassistance eligible:										
White	40	71	24	38	61	6	39	32	44	639
Black	30	77	14	38	56	4	33	26	56	1,355
Spanish American	34	88	15	40	52	5	42	36	64	255
Indian	44	79	35	39	56	13	39	43	48	23
Ineligible:										
White	40	78	31	42	65	8	91	54	38	734
Black	33	86	21	41	62	6	91	45	42	1,081
Spanish American	42	89	12	29	61	5	66	53	47	625
Indian	40	90	25	50	65	10	95	58	30	20

Table A-7—Food consumption practices, food expenditures, and family size, EFNEP families, by food program status and monthly income, 1969

Monthly family income and food program	Homemakers with food group servings during 24-hour period of—						Families with—		Families reporting
	Milk, 2 or more	Meat, 2 or more	Fruit and vegetable, 4 or more	Bread and cereal, 4 or more	1-1-1-1 diet	2-2-4-4 diet	Monthly family food expenditure of $85 or more	5 members or more	
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Number*
Food stamp:									
Less than $100	31	71	19	37	54	8	5	40	253
$100-$199	36	76	17	41	56	4	20	48	376
$200-$299	41	77	26	42	62	8	56	69	241
$300-$399	46	83	27	46	65	9	76	83	138
$400 or more	39	77	25	45	71	6	78	74	97
Food distribution:									
Less than $100	41	75	15	40	62	4	1	32	544
$100-$199	33	75	16	40	58	4	12	46	654
$200-$299	32	79	16	44	57	5	42	70	389
$300-$399	31	79	19	37	57	6	67	80	133
$400 or more	30	83	18	29	63	5	74	88	65
Nonassistance eligible:									
Less than $100	31	72	16	33	52	2	2	25	613
$100-$199	31	76	16	38	54	3	18	44	856
$200-$299	38	80	20	44	65	7	50	80	588
$300-$399	38	82	19	36	62	6	78	98	172
$400 or more	35	85	29	38	55	11	95	100	65
Ineligible:									
Less than $100	42	85	12	14	55	3	5	29	87
$100-$199	40	83	16	28	61	5	21	18	294
$200-$299	33	82	18	34	58	5	38	28	689
$300-$399	35	85	21	41	62	6	55	49	676
$400 or more	40	85	30	46	68	8	73	59	747

Table A-8—Food consumption practices, family income and size, EFNEP families, by food program status and monthly family food expenditures, 1969

Food program status and monthly family food expenditure	Homemakers with food group servings during 24-hour period of—						Families with—		Families reporting
	Milk, 2 or more	Meat, 2 or more	Fruit and vegetable, 4 or more	Bread and cereal, 4 or more	1-1-1-1 diet	2-2-4-4 diet	Monthly family income of 3000 or more	5 members or more	
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Number*
Food stamps worth:									
Less than $45	33	72	22	39	58	8	7	35	322
$45-$64	35	78	17	39	55	4	22	45	199
$65-$84	37	77	22	42	57	5	49	65	202
$85-$104	37	82	23	42	60	6	69	71	154
$105-$124	44	73	17	39	54	4	74	81	82
$125 or more	46	80	31	48	69	13	89	85	172
Food distribution worth:									
Less than $45	38	75	18	42	60	5	8	35	799
$45-$64	36	76	14	42	58	3	27	50	344
$65-$84	32	80	19	41	61	5	50	58	262
$85-$104	36	76	15	40	57	4	69	75	185
$105-$124	23	84	11	27	49	3	80	84	63
$125 or more	35	81	16	38	63	4	89	86	134
Nonassistance eligible:									
Less than $45	33	72	15	34	55	2	7	26	751
$45-$64	32	78	17	40	54	4	23	74	435
$65-$84	30	83	18	42	60	5	48	63	360
$85-$104	34	81	20	41	61	7	68	80	283
$105-$124	39	84	16	42	57	4	73	92	106
$125 or more	40	82	24	38	62	8	86	90	245
Ineligible:									
Less than $45	35	82	20	34	64	6	56	15	338
$45-$64	31	81	22	39	57	5	77	22	393
$65-$84	36	84	20	37	64	6	86	36	478
$85-$104	39	85	24	37	62	7	92	45	490
$105-$124	42	90	21	43	62	8	96	59	231
$125 or more	39	85	25	40	64	7	97	70	482

Table A-9—Socioeconomic characteristics of EFNEP families, by region, 1969

Characteristic	Unit	United States	Northeast	North Central	South	West	Puerto Rico
Personal:							
Residence	No.[1]	8,560	814	1,284	5,680	296	486
Urban	Pct.	57	67	75	52	47	69
Rural nonfarm	do.	34	32	20	38	45	31
Farm	do.	8	2	6	11	8	0
Age of homemaker	No.[1]	7,492	733	860	5,188	253	458
10-29 years	Pct.	24	34	26	21	33	29
30-39	do.	24	26	30	23	27	22
40-49	do.	19	16	20	19	16	24
50-59	do.	12	8	10	14	10	13
60-69	do.	12	8	9	13	9	8
70 and over	do.	8	8	5	9	6	4
Education of homemaker	No.[1]	7,726	672	1,219	5,137	247	451
No education	Pct.	3	1	0	3	0	10
1-3 years	do.	8	4	3	8	4	27
4-7	do.	30	16	17	35	13	42
8-11	do.	42	46	54	40	47	17
12 or more	do.	17	32	26	14	35	4
Racial or ethnic group	No.[1]	8,902	836	1,351	5,898	316	501
White	Pct.	31	46	41	28	35	1
Black	do.	53	43	53	61	16	0
Spanish American	do.	15	12	3	10	36	99
Oriental	do.	0	0	0	0	0	0
Indian	do.	2	0	3	1	13	0
Other	do.	0	0	0	0	0	0
Home garden[2]	No.[1]	8,489	808	1,273	5,628	294	486
Yes	Pct.	33	13	24	40	22	10
No	do.	67	87	76	60	78	90
On welfare	No.[1]	8,654	840	1,326	5,688	302	498
Yes	Pct.	32	40	36	31	31	22
No	do.	68	60	64	69	69	78
Family:							
Family size	No.[1]	9,031	865	1,361	5,977	318	510
1 member	Pct.	10	12	8	10	10	5
2	do.	14	15	13	15	13	9
3	do.	13	12	12	13	12	14
4	do.	14	15	14	13	14	22
5	do.	12	13	14	11	18	13
6	do.	11	13	12	10	13	13
7	do.	8	8	10	8	6	7
8	do.	6	5	7	6	6	7
9	do.	4	3	5	5	3	4
10 or more	do.	7	3	8	8	6	6
Families with children 19 and under	No.[1]	9,031	865	1,361	5,977	318	510
No children	Pct.	24	25	19	25	21	16
1	do.	11	10	9	12	13	14
2	do.	13	13	13	13	14	22
3	do.	13	15	15	12	18	16
4	do.	11	13	11	11	14	11
5	do.	9	10	11	9	8	8
6	do.	6	7	8	6	6	5
7	do.	5	4	5	5	3	4
8	do.	4	2	4	4	2	3
9	do.	2	1	2	2	1	0
10 or more	do.	2	0	2	2	1	1

See footnotes at end of table.

Continued

Table A-9—Socioeconomic characteristics of EFNEP families, by region, 1969—Continued

Characteristic	Unit	United States	Northeast	North Central	South	West	Puerto Rico
Families with children in school	No.[1]	9,031	865	1,361	5,977	318	510
No children	Pct.	40	44	32	41	37	42
1	do.	13	11	12	13	15	16
2	do.	13	12	13	13	14	15
3	do.	11	13	13	10	13	10
4	do.	9	8	10	9	11	8
5	do.	6	5	9	6	5	4
6	do.	4	3	5	4	3	2
7	do.	4	3	6	4	3	2
Families with children in school lunch program	No.[1]	9,031	865	1,361	5,977	318	510
No children	Pct.	57	69	53	55	57	66
1	do.	11	8	10	11	12	12
2	do.	10	10	10	11	9	9
3	do.	8	6	10	8	10	5
4	do.	6	3	5	6	5	4
5	do.	4	2	6	4	3	3
6	do.	2	1	3	2	2	1
7	do.	2	0	3	2	2	1
Economic:							
Homeownership	No.[1]	8,682	824	1,329	5,723	306	500
Yes	Pct.	45	33	38	44	61	73
No	do.	55	67	62	56	39	27
Monthly payment for residence	No.[1]	4,240	510	844	2,603	148	135
$1-$24	Pct.	19	3	5	26	1	48
$25-$49	do.	36	15	22	45	8	45
$50-$74	do.	28	46	38	22	43	4
$75-$99	do.	12	26	24	5	36	3
$100 or more	do.	5	9	11	2	12	0
Monthly family income	No.[1]	7,674	642	1,138	5,149	248	497
Less than $100	Pct.	20	9	6	23	9	36
$100-$199	do.	28	17	24	31	22	32
$200-$299	do.	25	25	25	25	23	25
$300-$399	do.	15	24	20	13	17	6
$400 or more	do.	13	25	25	9	29	1
Monthly food expenditure	No.[1]	7,736	691	1,155	5,144	252	494
Less than $45	Pct.	29	18	14	35	15	26
$45-$64	do.	18	13	14	20	17	16
$65-$84	do.	17	17	18	17	18	18
$85-$104	do.	15	17	20	13	22	15
$105-$124	do.	6	8	10	5	6	10
$125 or more	do.	14	27	24	9	22	16
Per capita monthly income[3]	No.[1]	7,666	642	1,138	5,142	247	497
Less than $20	Pct.	14	3	4	16	4	34
$20-$39	do.	26	11	24	28	15	30
$40-$59	do.	23	26	28	21	26	20
$60-$79	do.	15	26	15	14	14	10
$80 or more	do.	23	34	29	21	41	6

See footnotes at end of table.

Continued

Table A-9—Socioeconomic characteristics of EFNEP families, by region, 1969—Continued

Characteristic	Unit	United States	Northeast	North Central	South	West	Puerto Rico
Per capita monthly food expenditure[3]	No.[1]	7,684	687	1,146	5,112	248	491
Less than $10	Pct.	22	6	12	27	8	24
$10-$14	do.	21	13	21	23	19	19
$15-$19	do.	16	17	19	15	20	15
$20-$24	do.	15	20	17	14	15	16
$25-$29	do.	9	15	12	8	14	8
$30 or more	do.	17	30	20	14	24	18
Food programs and practices:							
Where food is purchased	No.[1]	8,593	839	1,321	5,644	311	478
Supermarket	Pct.	71	87	82	69	75	34
Small local store	do.	26	11	14	27	23	63
Both	do.	3	2	3	4	2	2
Food program in area	No.[1]	9,031	865	1,361	5,977	318	510
Food distribution	Pct.	30	35	16	32	15	49
Food stamp	do.	36	45	52	33	48	1
Both	do.	3	0	3	4	1	0
No program or no answer	do.	31	20	29	31	36	50
Distance to store	No.[1]	8,390	820	1,285	5,546	312	427
Less than 1 mile	Pct.	36	42	38	31	30	81
1-5 miles	do.	41	35	43	44	40	14
More than 5 miles	do.	23	23	19	25	30	5
Distance to food distribution center	No.[1]	2,770	284	270	2,018	56	142
Less than 1 mile	Pct.	16	34	16	11	12	56
1-5 miles	do.	34	43	29	34	59	20
More than 5 miles	do.	49	22	55	55	29	24
Distance to food stamp center	No.[1]	2,969	340	551	1,930	147	1
Less than 1 mile	Pct.	19	30	19	16	26	0
1-5 miles	do.	38	34	41	36	52	100
More than 5 miles	do.	43	36	40	48	21	0
Transportation to store	No.[1]	7,896	796	1,201	5,230	296	373
Walk	Pct.	23	29	19	19	16	79
Own car	do.	49	41	55	51	70	8
Bus or taxi	do.	9	18	11	8	3	10
Other	do.	19	13	16	22	11	4
Transportation to food distribution center	No.[1]	1,848	211	151	1,381	21	84
Walk	Pct.	9	11	12	5	29	62
Own Car	do.	38	34	38	41	43	1
Bus or taxi	do.	12	20	15	10	5	25
Other	do.	41	35	35	45	24	12
Transportation to food stamp center	No.[1]	1,375	181	256	860	77	1
Walk	Pct.	14	25	12	12	14	100
Own car	do.	36	20	42	36	57	0
Bus or taxi	do.	19	48	23	13	8	0
Other	do.	31	7	24	39	21	0
Homemaker's food consumption 1-1-1-1 diet	No.[1]	9,031	865	1,361	5,977	318	510
No	Pct.	41	36	35	44	31	40
Yes	do.	59	64	65	56	69	60

See footnotes at end of table.

Continued

Table A-9—Socioeconomic characteristics of EFNEP families, by region, 1969—Continued

Characteristic	Unit	United States	Northeast	North Central	South	West	Puerto Rico
2-2-4-4 diet	No.[1]	9,031	865	1,361	5,977	318	510
No	Pct.	95	94	92	96	88	98
Yes	do.	5	6	8	4	12	2
Milk servings	No.[1]	9,031	865	1,361	5,977	318	510
No servings	Pct.	32	28	28	36	24	17
1	do.	33	31	29	33	32	39
2	do.	21	24	23	20	24	27
3	do.	10	13	12	8	13	13
4 or more	do.	4	5	7	3	7	4
Meat servings	No.[1]	9,031	865	1,361	5,977	318	510
No servings	Pct.	4	4	3	4	4	2
1	do.	17	21	19	17	20	12
2	do.	32	38	38	31	30	30
3	do.	27	23	24	28	26	32
4 or more	do.	19	13	16	20	21	24
Fruit and vegetable servings	No.[1]	9,031	865	1,361	5,977	318	510
No servings	Pct.	12	10	10	12	9	29
1	do.	25	21	19	26	14	31
2	do.	28	25	27	29	18	23
3	do.	17	21	20	17	20	10
4 or more	do.	19	23	24	16	39	7
Bread and cereal servings	No.[1]	9,031	865	1,361	5,977	318	510
No servings	Pct.	3	4	4	2	6	1
1	do.	9	13	10	8	8	13
2	do.	21	22	20	19	14	36
3	do.	29	26	28	30	28	34
4 or more	do.	39	34	38	41	43	16

[1]Number of families reporting information for respective characteristics. [2] Yes indicates family has a garden during the gardening season. [3] Average per family member.

Table A-10—Summary of socioeconomic characteristics of EFNEP families, food program status and region, 1969

Characteristic	Unit	Food stamp					Food distribution					
		North-east	North Central	South	West	Total	North-east	North Central	South	West	Puerto Rico	Total
Family or homemaker:												
Number in family	Number	5.2	5.4	5.7	4.3	5.5	4.3	5.9	4.9	7.3	5.6	5.0
Children 19 and under	do.	3.5	4.0	3.9	2.7	3.9	2.8	4.2	3.1	4.5	3.6	3.2
Children in school	do.	2.2	2.8	2.4	2.0	2.4	1.6	2.8	2.0	2.8	2.0	2.0
Children in school lunch	do.	1.1	1.8	1.8	1.6	1.7	.9	2.5	1.4	2.2	1.2	1.4
Age of homemaker	Years	37	38	45	42	42	45	42	48	45	40	47
Education of homemaker	do.	10.1	9.4	7.2	8.5	8.2	9.0	8.0	7.4	7.9	4.5	7.5
Food consumption of homemaker (food group servings during 24 hours):												
Milk	Servings	1.4	1.5	1.0	1.9	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	.9	1.5	1.2
Meat	do.	2.3	2.4	2.3	2.7	2.4	1.9	2.3	2.5	2.3	2.4	2.4
Fruit and vegetable	do.	2.6	2.4	2.0	3.0	2.2	2.0	2.3	2.1	2.7	1.0	2.0
Bread and cereal	do.	2.9	3.2	3.3	3.5	3.2	2.8	3.4	3.4	2.9	2.6	3.3
Total	do.	9.2	9.5	8.6	11.1	9.0	7.9	9.2	9.2	8.8	7.5	8.9
Monthly family income and food expenditures:												
Income	Dollars	323	254	142	196	199	227	208	155	221	95	164
Per capita	do.	62	47	25	46	36	53	35	32	30	17	33
Food expenditures	do.	99	95	61	85	76	85	78	54	58	58	60
Per capita	do.	19	18	11	20	14	20	13	11	8	10	12
Percent of income spent for food	Percent	31	37	43	43	39	37	38	35	26	61	37
Families reporting	Number	179	300	718	77	1,274	220	180	1,485	21	131	2,037

Continued

Table A-10—Summary of socioeconomic characteristics of EFNEP families, food program status and region, 1969-Continued

Characteristic	Unit	Nonassistance eligible						Ineligible					
		North-east	North Central	South	West	Puerto Rico	Total	North-east	North Central	South	West	Puerto Rico	Total
Family or homemaker:													
Number in family	Number	4.6	5.6	5.1	4.8	5.8	5.1	4.1	4.4	4.3	4.6	4.7	4.4
Children 19 and under	do.	3.0	3.9	3.3	3.2	3.6	3.4	2.1	2.5	2.3	2.6	2.5	2.4
Children in school	do.	1.8	2.6	2.0	2.0	2.3	2.1	1.3	1.8	1.4	1.7	1.4	1.5
Children in school lunch	do.	.8	1.6	1.4	1.3	1.2	1.4	.6	.9	1.0	.8	.7	.9
Age of homemaker	Years	39	42	46	45	41	45	38	38	40	34	40	39
Education of homemaker	do.	8.3	9.0	7.4	9.2	5.5	7.8	10.1	10.1	8.9	10.5	5.6	8.8
Food consumption of homemaker (food group servings during 24 hours):													
Milk	Servings	1.5	1.4	1.1	1.4	1.5	1.2	1.4	1.6	1.1	1.6	1.5	1.3
Meat	do.	2.4	2.3	2.5	2.4	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.5	2.7	2.6	2.8	2.7
Fruit and vegetable	do.	2.5	2.3	2.0	2.9	1.4	2.1	2.9	2.9	2.3	3.3	1.6	2.4
Bread and cereal	do.	3.2	3.1	3.2	3.3	2.3	3.2	3.1	3.3	3.3	3.5	2.6	3.2
Total	do.	9.6	9.1	8.8	10.0	7.8	9.0	9.8	10.3	9.4	11.0	8.5	9.6
Monthly family income and food expenditures:													
Income	Dollars	239	229	144	186	86	166	409	403	321	428	168	320
Per capita	do.	52	41	28	39	15	32	100	92	75	93	36	73
Food expenditures	do.	94	89	62	79	58	69	120	112	86	116	89	93
Per capita	do.	20	16	12	16	10	14	29	25	20	25	19	21
Percent of income spent for food	Percent	39	39	43	42	67	42	29	28	27	27	53	29
Families reporting	Number	191	370	1,658	60	27	2,306	133	334	1,578	109	340	2,494

Table A-11—Selected socioeconomic characteristics of EFNEP families, by food program status and region, 1969

Characteristic	Unit	Food stamp						Food distribution					
		Northeast	North Central	South	West	Puerto Rico	Total	Northeast	North Central	South	West	Puerto Rico	Total
Personal:													
Residence	No.[1]	171	278	682	71	0	1,202	198	179	1,407	16	126	1,926
Urban	Pct.	61	78	39	37	0	51	46	60	45	19	77	48
Rural nonfarm	do.	35	20	42	54	0	37	53	25	43	81	23	41
Farm	do.	4	2	18	10	0	12	2	14	13	0	0	11
Age of homemaker	No.[1]	158	178	607	69	0	1,012	195	140	1,307	14	123	1,779
10-29	Pct.	39	22	17	25	0	22	25	21	16	14	26	18
30-39	do.	30	44	23	25	0	28	22	26	22	29	25	22
40-49	do.	15	17	24	20	0	21	20	20	17	21	24	18
50-59	do.	6	8	16	10	0	13	12	19	15	14	14	15
60-69	do.	6	4	13	13	0	10	10	10	17	14	6	15
70 or more	do.	4	3	8	7	0	6	12	4	13	7	5	12
Education of homemaker	No.[1]	160	264	641	59	0	1,124	201	169	1,295	19	111	1,795
0	Pct.	1	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	16	4
1-3 years	do.	2	3	8	5	0	6	4	6	9	10	37	10
4-7	do.	11	12	41	25	0	29	17	28	39	32	37	36
8-11	do.	44	62	42	49	0	47	52	57	39	47	8	40
12 or more	do.	42	22	7	20	0	16	25	10	10	10	2	11
Racial or ethnic group	No.[1]	179	297	711	77	0	1,264	203	180	1,458	21	129	1,991
White	Pct.	58	40	36	17	0	39	70	44	29	24	0	32
Black	do.	37	52	62	21	0	53	18	52	63	0	0	52
Spanish American	do.	5	1	2	62	0	6	11	2	6	0	100	12
Oriental	do.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Indian	do.	0	6	0	0	0	2	0	2	2	76	0	3
Other	do.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Home garden[2]	No.[1]	171	279	685	75	0	1,210	216	169	1,388	19	124	1,916
Yes	Pct.	25	14	51	24	0	37	14	47	47	26	10	41
No	do.	75	86	49	76	0	63	86	53	53	74	90	59
On welfare	No.[1]	178	297	698	76	0	1,249	215	179	1,423	20	129	1,966
Yes	Pct.	42	75	56	60	0	59	60	45	51	55	63	52
No	do.	58	25	44	40	0	41	40	55	49	45	37	48
Family:													
Family size	No.[1]	179	300	718	77	0	1,274	220	180	1,485	21	131	2,037
1	Pct.	7	7	7	13	0	7	14	4	13	5	7	12
2	do.	9	11	14	17	0	12	19	7	16	5	7	15
3	do.	11	10	8	21	0	10	10	10	12	14	12	12
4	do.	19	13	12	6	0	13	12	12	10	10	13	10

See footnotes at end of table.

Continued

Table A-11—Selected socioeconomic characteristics of EFNEP families, by food program status and region, 1969—Continued

Characteristic	Unit	Nonassistance eligible						Ineligible					
		North-east	North Central	South	West	Puerto Rico	Total	North-east	North Central	South	West	Puerto Rico	Total
Personal:													
Residence	No.[1]	185	353	1,587	55	24	2,204	128	313	1,517	106	325	2,389
Urban	Pct.	80	75	51	49	62	58	70	77	62	60	67	65
Rural nonfarm	do.	20	20	38	44	38	34	30	18	33	30	33	30
Farm	do.	0	5	11	7	0	9	1	4	6	9	0	5
Age of homemaker	No.[1]	153	215	1,472	51	22	1,913	121	232	1,402	89	301	2,145
10-29	Pct.	40	25	18	18	27	21	34	35	31	44	30	32
30-39	do.	23	28	24	31	14	24	30	25	24	32	22	24
40-49	do.	13	22	18	14	32	18	19	18	18	15	24	19
50-59	do.	8	6	13	10	18	12	7	8	13	7	13	12
60-69	do.	9	9	14	12	4	13	6	10	10	2	9	10
70 or more	do.	6	9	13	16	4	12	5	3	4	1	3	4
Education of homemaker	No.[1]	136	339	1,446	46	24	1,991	103	302	1,393	83	304	2,185
0	Pct.	2	1	4	0	21	4	1	0	3	0	8	3
1-3 years	do.	10	2	10	6	12	8	5	2	5	1	24	7
4-7	do.	24	22	38	13	54	34	12	12	25	6	43	24
8-11	do.	46	54	39	52	12	42	36	47	42	47	21	40
12 or more	do.	18	21	9	28	0	12	47	39	25	46	4	26
Racial or ethnic group	No.[1]	184	368	1,638	59	27	2,276	129	334	1,559	108	333	2,463
White	Pct.	33	40	25	29	0	28	38	46	31	45	2	30
Black	do.	52	54	64	17	0	60	44	47	54	19	0	44
Spanish American	do.	16	3	10	39	100	11	17	4	14	32	98	25
Oriental	do.	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Indian	do.	0	3	0	14	0	1	0	2	1	4	0	1
Other	do.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Home garden[2]	No.[1]	181	347	1,585	54	24	2,191	123	321	1,503	101	326	2,374
Yes	Pct.	9	23	40	24	17	34	11	22	32	17	8	25
No	do.	91	77	60	76	83	66	89	78	68	83	92	75
On welfare	No.[1]	186	360	1,596	57	27	2,226	126	325	1,491	103	330	2,375
Yes	Pct.	47	36	29	42	100	33	11	8	8	7	0	7
No	do.	53	64	71	58	0	67	89	92	92	93	100	93
Family size	No.[1]	191	370	1,658	60	27	2,306	133	334	1,578	109	340	2,494
1	Pct.	12	9	11	18	0	11	8	5	7	6	5	7
2	do.	13	9	14	13	15	13	22	16	16	13	9	15
3	do.	14	9	10	8	7	10	14	16	20	9	16	18
4	do.	13	13	11	12	18	12	18	19	17	17	25	18

See footnotes at end of table.

Continued

Table A-11—Selected socioeconomic characteristics of EFNEP families, by food program status and region, 1969—Continued

Characteristic	Unit	Food stamp						Food distribution					
		Northeast	North Central	South	West	Puerto Rico	Total	Northeast	North Central	South	West	Puerto Rico	Total
Family size—continued													
5	do.	11	11	9	12	0	10	13	14	11	19	12	11
6	do.	16	16	12	12	0	14	10	14	10	5	17	11
7	do.	5	10	10	5	0	9	10	12	9	0	7	9
8	do.	8	9	8	6	0	8	6	8	6	10	9	6
9	do.	8	4	7	4	0	6	3	9	6	5	8	6
10 or more	do.	6	9	12	4	0	10	3	9	9	29	8	8
Children 19 and under	No.[1]	179	300	718	77	0	1,274	220	180	1,485	21	131	2,037
0	Pct.	14	13	18	23	0	17	28	12	29	10	16	26
1	do.	8	8	7	17	0	8	11	8	9	14	6	9
2	do.	13	11	11	14	0	12	10	10	11	19	14	12
3	do.	19	14	11	10	0	13	13	13	10	10	14	11
4	do.	12	14	11	12	0	12	10	11	10	10	16	11
5	do.	11	14	12	9	0	12	11	12	9	0	9	9
6	do.	8	11	8	6	0	8	9	12	6	10	8	7
7	do.	6	5	8	4	0	7	4	10	4	5	9	5
8	do.	5	5	6	3	0	5	3	5	5	5	5	5
9	do.	2	3	4	1	0	4	1	5	2	5	0	2
10 or more	do.	1	3	3	0	0	3	0	2	2	14	2	2
Children in school	No.[1]	179	300	718	77	0	1,274	220	180	1,485	21	131	2,037
0	Pct.	38	26	30	42	0	31	44	24	40	19	31	38
1	do.	8	9	11	10	0	10	12	11	13	24	17	13
2	do.	13	15	17	8	0	15	12	12	12	14	14	12
3	do.	13	12	12	12	0	12	14	16	11	14	14	12
4	do.	11	14	11	14	0	12	7	11	9	0	10	9
5	do.	8	9	8	6	0	8	6	12	6	14	7	7
6	do.	4	8	6	4	0	6	3	6	4	0	4	4
7	do.	6	7	6	4	0		2	8	6	14	2	5
Children in school lunch program	No.[1]	179	300	718	77	0	1,274	220	180	1,485	21	131	2,037
0	Pct.	9	7	2	51	0	46	68	32	55	43	52	54
1	do.	10	8	13	8	0	10	10	10	10	19	18	11
2	do.	14	10	14	10	0	13	6	12	10	5	10	10
3	do.	4	12	10	10	0	10	9	17	9	5	8	10
4	do.	5	7	10	12	0	8	2	7	6	0	6	6
5	do.	4	8	5	3	0	6	3	12	4	14	5	5
6	do.	2	5	4	5	0	4	2	5	2	0	2	3
7	do.	1	3	3	1	0	3	1	6	3	14	0	3

See footnotes at end of table.

Continued

Table A-11—Selected socioeconomic characteristics of EFNEP families, by food program status and region, 1969—Continued

Characteristic	Unit	Nonassistance eligible						Ineligible					
		Northeast	North Central	South	West	Puerto Rico	Total	Northeast	North Central	South	West	Puerto Rico	Total
Family size—continued													
5	do.	13	14	11	10	15	12	14	17	13	21	14	14
6	do.	16	9	10	8	4	10	14	12	11	18	12	12
7	do.	7	11	9	12	11	10	6	7	7	5	7	7
8	do.	7	8	8	5	15	8	2	5	4	1	6	5
9	do.	3	7	5	0	4	5	0	1	3	3	2	2
10 or more	do.	3	12	10	13	11	10	2	2	3	0	4	3
Children 19 and under	No.[1]	191	370	1,658	60	27	2,306	133	334	1,578	109	340	2,494
0	Pct.	22	18	26	28	7	24	29	20	25	20	17	24
1	do.	9	7	9	10	22	9	15	13	18	10	17	17
2	do.	16	10	11	8	11	11	15	20	17	17	25	18
3	do.	14	15	11	8	22	12	15	20	14	22	15	15
4	do.	15	10	11	12	4	11	15	10	10	18	9	11
5	do.	10	12	10	12	7	10	7	9	6	5	7	7
6	do.	5	8	7	10	11	7	3	4	4	4	4	4
7	do.	4	8	6	2	4	6	0	1	2	4	2	2
8	do.	3	5	4	5	4	4	1	2	1	0	2	1
9	do.	0	3	2	3	4	2	0	1	1	0	0	1
10 or more	do.	1	4	2	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	1	0
Children in school	No.[1]	191	370	1,658	60	27	2,306	133	334	1,578	109	340	2,494
0	Pct.	44	31	39	38	37	38	49	35	48	37	46	46
1	do.	11	10	12	15	11	12	14	18	15	12	16	16
2	do.	12	12	11	8	18	11	12	15	13	18	15	14
3	do.	13	11	11	8	0	11	10	14	9	16	9	10
4	do.	9	10	9	17	11	9	10	8	7	10	7	7
5	do.	4	11	8	5	11	8	3	6	4	4	3	4
6	do.	4	6	5	3	7	5	2	1	2	3	2	2
7	do.	4	9	4	5	4	5	0	2	1	0	2	1
Children in school lunch program	No.[1]	191	370	1,658	60	27	2,306	133	334	1,578	109	340	2,494
0	Pct.	73	54	54	60	56	56	68	61	62	62	72	64
1	do.	5	8	11	10	18	10	12	14	12	14	9	12
2	do.	7	10	9	7	11	9	12	9	11	8	8	10
3	do.	7	10	9	10	4	9	5	8	6	11	4	6
4	do.	4	4	7	5	4	6	2	5	5	4	3	4
5	do.	2	7	5	2	4	5	1	2	3	1	1	2
6	do.	2	3	2	3	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	1
7	do.	0	4	2	3	4	3	0	1	1	0	1	1

See footnotes at end of table.

Continued

Table A-11—Selected socioeconomic characteristics of EFNEP families, by food program status and region, 1969—Continued

Characteristic	Unit	Food stamp						Food distribution					
		North-east	North Central	South	West	Puerto Rico	Total	North-east	North Central	South	West	Puerto Rico	Total
Economic:													
Home ownership	No.[1]	175	299	676	72	0	1,222	216	168	1,421	21	127	1,953
Yes	Pct.	38	23	32	54	0	32	36	38	43	76	68	44
No	do.	62	77	68	46	0	68	64	62	57	24	32	56
Monthly payment for residence	No.[1]	141	215	304	34	0	694	103	93	637	1	43	877
$1-$24	Pct.	5	3	38	3	0	19	5	19	28	0	72	26
$25-$49	do.	21	21	47	9	0	32	18	57	48	0	23	44
$50-$74	do.	47	46	12	59	0	32	36	20	18	100	2	20
$75-$99	do.	24	22	2	26	0	14	32	2	4	0	2	7
$100 or more	do.	4	8	0	3	0	4	9	1	2	0	0	2
Monthly family income	No.[1]	156	270	608	70	0	1,104	166	165	1,316	9	129	1,785
Less than $100	Pct.	8	6	36	7	0	23	17	8	32	44	64	30
$100-$199	do.	10	29	41	44	0	34	25	47	38	22	23	37
$200-$299	do.	26	30	16	36	0	22	28	27	22	0	11	22
$300-$399	do.	26	22	5	10	0	12	20	9	6	11	2	8
$400 or more	do.	31	13	2	3	0	9	10	9	2	22	0	4
Monthly food expenditures	No.[1]	166	280	611	73	0	1,130	171	164	1,315	9	128	1,787
Less than $45	Pct.	14	16	39	22	0	28	22	21	51	56	44	45
$45-$64	do.	12	13	21	19	0	18	16	20	20	22	20	19
$65-$84	do.	19	18	17	19	0	18	19	23	13	0	14	15
$85-$104	do.	14	18	11	16	0	14	17	18	9	11	8	10
$105-$124	do.	11	12	4	6	0	7	8	6	3	0	4	4
$125 or more	do.	30	23	7	18	0	15	19	12	5	11	9	8
Per capita monthly income[3]	No.[1]	156	271	606	70	0	1,103	166	165	1,316	9	129	1,785
Less than $20	Pct.	3	2	33	3	0	19	6	13	21	33	66	22
$20-$39	do.	12	34	37	30	0	32	15	46	34	0	22	32
$40-$59	do.	30	36	16	29	0	24	32	24	21	44	7	21
$60-$79	do.	22	12	9	11	0	12	25	7	12	11	4	12
$80 or more	do.	34	16	5	27	0	13	22	10	13	11	1	12
Per capita monthly food expenditures[3]	No.[1]	166	279	602	71	0	1,118	171	164	1,310	9	126	1,780
Less than $10	Pct.	10	11	38	10	0	26	5	29	37	67	46	34
$10-$14	do.	14	21	28	17	0	24	18	31	23	0	23	23
$15-$19	do.	19	25	13	27	0	18	16	15	13	11	15	14
$20-$24	do.	24	19	9	16	0	14	19	10	10	0	10	11
$25-$29	do.	11	12	5	13	0	8	12	6	6	11	2	6
$30 or more	do.	21	11	7	18	0	11	29	8	10	11	4	11

See footnotes at end of table.

Continued

Table A-11—Selected socioeconomic characteristics of EFNEP families, by food program status and region, 1969—Continued

Characteristic	Unit	Nonassistance eligible						Ineligible					
		North-east	North Central	South	West	Puerto Rico	Total	North-east	North Central	South	West	Puerto Rico	Total
Economic:													
Home ownership	No.[1]	175	358	1,591	59	27	2,210	128	330	1,533	106	334	2,431
Yes	Pct.	26	30	42	64	78	40	38	53	53	58	74	55
No	do.	74	70	58	36	22	60	62	47	47	42	26	45
Monthly payment for residence	No.[1]	135	240	777	25	8	1,185	84	193	740	68	82	1,167
$1-$24	Pct.	2	3	30	0	50	21	2	2	14	0	35	12
$25-$49	do.	13	24	48	8	25	38	8	13	41	6	58	33
$50-$74	do.	52	41	17	40	12	26	49	39	34	37	4	34
$75-$99	do.	24	25	3	44	12	11	26	32	7	40	2	14
$100 or more	do.	9	7	2	8	0	4	14	14	4	18	0	7
Monthly family income	No.[1]	189	370	1,648	60	27	2,294	132	334	1,578	109	340	2,493
Less than $100	Pct.	10	10	32	22	70	27	0	0	1	0	23	4
$100-$199	do.	28	29	41	30	22	37	2	4	10	4	36	12
$200-$299	do.	30	32	24	35	7	26	16	13	32	10	32	28
$300-$399	do.	23	18	4	10	0	8	26	26	32	27	8	27
$400 or more	do.	10	10	0	3	0	3	37	58	26	60	2	30
Monthly food expenditures	No.[1]	185	360	1,551	57	27	2,180	129	316	1,526	105	336	2,412
Less than $45	Pct.	20	18	40	18	44	34	9	5	16	6	18	14
$45-$64	do.	15	15	21	28	22	20	8	10	19	10	13	16
$65-$84	do.	15	19	16	21	4	16	16	15	21	17	20	20
$85-$105	do.	18	17	11	18	15	13	16	25	20	27	18	20
$105-$124	do.	6	9	4	2	4	5	12	12	8	10	12	10
$125 or more	do.	25	21	7	14	11	11	39	32	16	30	18	20
Per capita monthly income[3]	No.[1]	189	370	1,645	60	27	2,291	132	333	1,576	108	340	2,489
Less than $20	Pct.	4	5	21	8	82	17	0	0	0	0	18	2
$20-$39	do.	14	30	44	28	7	38	0	0	5	0	34	8
$40-$59	do.	34	42	21	37	4	26	6	8	23	16	26	21
$60-$79	do.	33	14	10	13	7	12	20	22	21	17	13	20
$80 or more	do.	15	10	5	13	0	7	74	69	50	68	9	49
Per capita monthly food expenditures[3]	No.[1]	184	360	1,543	57	27	2,171	126	309	1,518	103	335	2,391
Less than $10	Pct.	6	12	31	9	56	26	1	2	8	2	14	8
$10-$14	do.	16	28	26	30	15	26	4	7	18	14	18	16
$15-$19	do.	18	21	16	16	18	17	12	14	17	18	15	16
$20-$24	do.	20	17	12	12	0	14	16	20	19	16	19	19
$25-$29	do.	13	9	6	16	0	7	24	17	13	16	10	14
$30 or more	do.	27	13	8	18	11	11	44	40	25	34	24	28

See footnotes at end of table.

Continued

Table A-11—Selected socioeconomic characteristics of EFNEP families, by food program status and region, 1969—Continued

Characteristic	Unit	Food stamp						Food distribution					
		North-east	North Central	South	West	Puerto Rico	Total	North-east	North Central	South	West	Puerto Rico	Total
Food programs and practices:													
Where food is purchased	No.[1]	178	295	679	76	0	1,228	217	176	1,370	21	116	1,900
Supermarket	Pct.	91	90	67	72	0	76	83	64	57	43	18	58
Small local store	do.	7	9	30	26	0	22	15	35	41	57	81	40
Both	do.	2	1	3	1	0	2	1	1	3	0	1	2
Food program in area	No.[1]	179	300	718	77	0	1,274	220	180	1,485	21	131	2,037
Donated food	Pct.	4	0	2	3	0	2	93	79	85	81	77	85
Food stamp	do.	90	85	81	78	0	83	0	1	2	0	0	2
Both	do.	1	0	6	1	0	4	1	13	3	0	0	3
No program or no answer	do.	5	14	12	18	0	12	6	7	10	19	23	10
Distance to store	No.[1]	172	277	681	75	0	1,205	216	173	1,351	21	105	1,866
Less than 1 mile	Pct.	38	40	27	24	0	31	42	40	34	33	90	39
1-5 miles	do.	29	42	42	49	0	41	33	36	43	52	9	39
More than 5 miles	do.	33	18	31	27	0	28	25	24	23	14	1	22
Distance to food distribution center	No.[1]	14	34	63	10	0	121	188	162	1,236	17	88	1,691
Less than 1 mile	Pct.	21	9	14	10	0	13	36	20	11	29	70	18
1-5 miles	do.	29	53	38	40	0	42	49	20	32	59	19	32
More than 5 miles	do.	50	38	48	50	0	45	15	60	56	12	10	49
Distance to food stamp center	No.[1]	144	205	604	69	0	1,022	4	3	64	0	0	71
Less than 1 mile	Pct.	25	22	15	16	0	18	25	0	25	0	0	24
1-5 miles	do.	26	43	29	56	0	33	25	0	42	0	0	39
More than 5 miles	do.	49	35	56	28	0	49	50	100	33	0	0	37
Transportation to store	No.[1]	175	261	646	69	0	1,151	202	163	1,292	20	93	1,770
Walk	Pct.	22	24	25	13	0	24	28	18	21	55	94	26
Own car	do.	54	38	33	59	0	39	32	46	44	35	2	40
Bus or taxi	do.	13	15	10	6	0	11	14	12	7	5	2	8
Other	do.	12	23	32	22	0	26	26	23	28	5	2	26
Transportation to food distribution center	No.[1]	7	6	41	6	0	60	159	114	1,082	9	69	1,433
Walk	Pct.	29	17	12	17	0	15	9	11	4	56	62	9
Own car	do.	0	50	22	50	0	25	33	36	40	22	1	37
Bus or taxi	do.	43	0	15	17	0	17	19	15	10	0	25	12
Other	do.	29	33	51	17	0	43	38	38	46	22	12	42

See footnotes at end of table.

Continued

Table A-11—Selected socioeconomic characteristics of EFNEP families, by food program status and region, 1969—Continued

Characteristic	Unit	Nonassistance eligible						Ineligible					
		North-east	North Central	South	West	Puerto Rico	Total	North-east	North Central	South	West	Puerto Rico	Total
Food programs and practices:													
Where food is purchased	No.[1]	182	353	1,592	57	25	2,209	126	328	1,525	109	326	2,414
Super market	Pct.	82	80	67	65	28	70	97	84	80	92	41	77
Small local store	do.	15	16	30	28	72	27	3	10	15	7	56	19
Both	do.	2	4	4	7	0	4	0	6	5	1	3	4
Food program in area	No.[1]	191	370	1,658	60	27	2,306	133	334	1,578	109	340	2,494
Donated food	Pct.	25	8	22	10	26	20	20	9	16	6	41	18
Food stamp	do.	49	55	39	47	0	42	44	48	34	50	1	33
Both	do.	0	1	4	0	0	3	0	0	4	1	0	2
No program or no answer	do.	26	35	36	43	74	35	35	42	46	43	58	46
Distance to store	No.[1]	180	356	1,547	58	23	2,164	126	318	1,495	109	288	2,336
Less than 1 mile	Pct.	42	42	32	29	70	35	37	37	30	33	78	37
1-5 miles	do.	34	42	44	45	30	43	37	42	46	28	16	40
More than 5 miles	do.	23	15	25	26	0	23	25	20	25	39	7	23
Distance to food distribution center	No.[1]	46	41	404	10	5	506	19	22	257	7	47	352
Less than 1 mile	Pct.	30	7	12	0	60	13	26	14	9	0	30	13
1-5 miles	do.	35	37	35	70	0	35	32	46	42	86	21	40
More than 5 miles	do.	35	56	53	30	40	51	42	41	49	14	49	47
Distance to food stamp center	No.[1]	95	145	634	30	0	904	54	113	479	43	1	690
Less than 1 mile	Pct.	25	22	19	23	0	20	33	21	12	40	0	17
1-5 miles	do.	46	41	36	57	0	38	33	40	44	49	100	43
More than 5 miles	do.	28	37	45	20	0	41	33	39	44	12	0	40
Transportation to store	No.[1]	174	331	1,473	57	16	2,051	121	299	1,397	106	254	2,177
Walk	Pct.	39	25	23	23	81	25	21	14	12	12	72	20
Own car	do.	25	50	44	53	0	43	64	71	71	84	10	64
Bus or taxi	do.	26	10	11	4	12	12	12	8	6	1	13	7
Other	do.	10	15	22	21	6	20	3	8	12	3	5	9
Transportation to food distribution center	No.[1]	33	20	177	2	5	237	4	6	56	2	10	78
Walk	Pct.	15	5	5	0	40	7	0	17	2	0	70	12
Own car	do.	39	40	38	0	0	37	100	50	66	100	0	59
Bus or taxi	do.	18	20	14	0	40	16	0	17	4	0	20	6
Other	do.	27	35	43	100	20	40	0	17	29	0	10	23

See footnotes at end of table.

Continued

Table A-11—Selected socioeconomic characteristics of EFNEP families, by food program status and region, 1969—Continued

Characteristic	Unit	Food stamp						Food distribution					
		North-east	North Central	South	West	Puerto Rico	Total	North-east	North Central	South	West	Puerto Rico	Total
Transportation to food stamp center	No.[1]	69	135	534	51	0	789	3	6	24	1	0	34
Walk	Pct.	26	13	12	14	0	13	0	0	8	0	0	6
Own car	do.	33	30	32	57	0	34	100	83	29	0	0	44
Bus or taxi	do.	30	28	13	6	0	17	0	0	17	0	0	12
Other	do.	10	29	43	24	0	36	0	17	46	100	0	38
Food consumption													
1-1-1-1 diet	No.[1]	179	300	718	77	0	1,274	220	180	1,485	21	131	2,037
No	Pct.	34	34	48	25	0	41	44	41	40	48	45	41
Yes	do.	66	66	52	75	0	59	56	59	60	52	55	59
2-2-4-4 diet	No.[1]	179	300	718	77	0	1,274	220	180	1,485	21	131	2,037
No	Pct.	96	90	96	79	0	94	97	94	95	100	99	96
Yes	do.	4	10	4	21	0	6	3	6	5	0	1	4
Milk servings	No.[1]	179	300	718	77	0	1,274	220	180	1,485	21	131	2,037
0	Pct.	27	25	39	16	0	32	30	35	32	33	15	31
1	do.	30	30	32	25	0	31	34	30	34	52	39	34
2	do.	29	23	18	31	0	21	21	22	20	10	30	21
3	do.	10	14	8	21	0	10	11	6	10	5	12	10
4 or more	do.	4	8	3	8	0	4	3	7	4	0	4	4
Meat servings	No.[1]	179	300	718	77	0	1,274	220	180	1,485	21	131	2,037
0	Pct.	5	3	7	6	0	6	7	3	4	5	2	4
1	do.	18	20	20	12	0	19	27	24	17	19	20	19
2	do.	39	36	30	30	0	32	43	35	31	29	34	33
3	do.	27	23	25	20	0	24	19	21	28	38	24	26
4 or more	do.	11	19	18	32	0	18	4	16	20	10	19	18
Fruit and vegetable servings	No.[1]	179	300	718	77	0	1,274	220	180	1,485	21	131	2,037
0	Pct.	7	10	13	13	0	12	16	7	11	14	36	13
1	do.	21	22	28	12	0	24	27	21	28	24	38	28
2	do.	24	26	28	17	0	26	25	33	29	14	18	28
3	do.	20	18	16	17	0	17	19	19	15	14	5	15
4 or more	do.	28	25	15	42	0	20	13	19	17	33	3	16
Bread and cereal servings	No.[1]	179	300	718	77	0	1,274	220	180	1,485	21	131	2,037
0	Pct.	3	3	2	6	0	3	6	2	2	10	2	2
1	do.	12	9	8	6	0	9	17	11	6	5	11	8
2	do.	23	17	20	14	0	20	28	21	18	10	40	21
3	do.	31	30	27	21	0	28	20	23	30	48	29	28
4 or more	do.	31	40	42	52	0	41	29	43	44	29	18	40

See footnotes at end of table.

Continued

Table A-11—Selected socioeconomic characteristics of EFNEP families, by food program status and region, 1969—Continued

Characteristic	Unit	Nonassistance eligible						Ineligible					
		North-east	North Central	South	West	Puerto Rico	Total	North-east	North Central	South	West	Puerto Rico	Total
Transportation to food stamp center	No.[1]	69	59	170	14	0	312	15	42	82	10	1	150
Walk	Pct.	23	12	14	21	0	16	27	10	4	10	100	9
Own car	do.	7	44	37	50	0	32	27	69	62	70	0	61
Bus or taxi	do.	64	22	13	14	0	26	47	10	13	10	0	15
Other	do.	6	22	36	14	0	26	0	12	21	10	0	15
Food consumption													
1-1-1-1 diet	No.[1]	191	370	1,658	60	27	2,306	133	334	1,578	109	340	2,494
No	Pct.	31	35	46	37	59	43	35	26	41	25	38	38
Yes	do.	69	65	54	63	41	57	65	74	59	75	62	62
2-2-4-4 diet	No.[1]	191	370	1,658	60	27	2,306	133	334	1,578	109	340	2,494
No	Pct.	89	94	97	85	100	96	92	90	94	90	97	94
Yes	do.	11	6	3	15	0	4	8	10	6	10	3	6
Milk servings	No.[1]	191	370	1,658	60	27	2,306	133	334	1,578	109	340	2,494
0	Pct.	25	27	38	33	26	34	32	23	35	22	18	30
1	do.	30	32	32	23	33	32	28	28	33	33	38	33
2	do.	22	26	19	30	15	21	21	25	21	21	27	22
3	do.	14	9	8	7	22	9	13	18	8	15	12	10
4 or more	do.	8	6	2	7	4	4	7	7	3	9	5	4
Meat servings	No.[1]	191	370	1,658	60	27	2,306	133	334	1,578	109	340	2,494
0	Pct.	4	4	5	5	7	4	2	2	2	2	2	2
1	do.	21	18	18	22	11	19	20	16	13	22	9	14
2	do.	32	38	30	25	30	31	40	39	32	29	27	32
3	do.	27	27	28	32	30	28	20	25	31	26	34	30
4 or more	do.	16	14	20	17	22	18	19	19	22	21	27	22
Fruit and vegetable servings	No.[1]	191	370	1,658	60	27	2,306	133	334	1,578	109	340	2,494
0	Pct.	11	14	12	10	41	13	5	5	9	4	26	10
1	do.	15	18	27	17	18	24	18	15	22	10	28	21
2	do.	24	26	29	15	26	28	21	26	30	19	25	28
3	do.	22	21	16	22	0	17	24	19	19	22	13	18
4 or more	do.	28	21	15	37	15	18	32	35	20	45	8	22
Bread and cereal servings	No.[1]	191	370	1,658	60	27	2,306	133	334	1,578	109	340	2,494
0	Pct.	3	4	2	5	7	2	4	2	2	5	1	2
1	do.	14	11	8	7	11	9	6	9	8	6	14	9
2	do.	16	20	20	17	37	20	20	21	19	15	35	21
3	do.	24	29	32	28	37	31	35	28	29	26	35	30
4 or more	do.	43	37	38	43	7	38	35	40	42	49	16	38

[1] Number of families reporting information for respective characteristics. [2] Yes indicates family has a garden during the gardening season. [3] Average per family member.

Table A-12—Food consumption practices, family income and food expenditures, and family size, EFNEP families, by food program status and welfare status, 1969

Food program and welfare status	Homemakers with servings during 24-hour period of—						Families with—			Families reporting
	Milk, 2 or more	Meat, 2 or more	Fruit and vegetable, 4 or more	Bread and cereal, 4 or more	1-1-1-1 diet	2-2-4-4 diet	Monthly family income of $200 or more	Monthly family food expenditure of $85 or more	5 members or more	
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Number*
Food stamp:										
Yes (receiving welfare)	27	75	19	38	56	6	37	33	57	736
No (not receiving)	36	75	23	43	63	7	52	41	60	514
Food distribution:										
Yes	34	73	15	37	57	4	29	20	48	1,024
No	36	79	17	43	60	5	38	22	54	942
Nonassistance eligible:										
Yes	34	74	17	37	54	4	28	21	45	727
No	33	78	18	39	58	5	40	33	57	1,499
Ineligible:										
Yes	34	78	19	41	64	5	74	38	34	164
No	37	85	22	38	62	6	85	51	42	2,211

Table A-13—Food consumption practices, family income and food expenditures, and family size, EFNEP families, by food program status and age of homemaker, 1969

Food program and age of homemaker	Homemakers with servings during 24-hour period of—						Families with—			Families reporting
	Milk, 2 or more	Meat, 2 or more	Fruit and vegetable, 4 or more	Bread and cereal, 4 or more	1-1-1-1 diet	2-2-4-4 diet	Monthly family income of $200 or more	Monthly family food expenditure of $85 or more	5 members or more	
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Number*
Food stamp:										
Less than 30 years	43	77	22	38	66	7	49	33	52	220
30-39	38	78	20	42	60	5	58	52	80	285
40-49	30	73	20	46	53	9	46	44	80	211
50-59	32	80	19	48	59	6	30	26	32	128
60-69	36	69	25	34	54	6	12	7	12	105
70 or more	27	66	22	33	52	5	5	2	5	64
Food distribution:										
Less than 30 years	34	75	16	38	58	4	39	28	59	315
30-39	37	80	15	45	58	5	50	35	82	400
40-49	36	81	18	44	63	6	43	29	69	324
50-59	35	79	18	41	57	3	22	11	34	267
60-69	34	76	20	36	60	3	13	6	13	263
70 or more	42	65	17	40	66	7	7	2	4	210
Nonassistance eligible:										
Less than 30 years	38	77	17	45	58	4	39	32	56	399
30-39	33	77	18	42	57	5	54	39	81	463
40-49	29	80	16	42	57	5	44	38	69	354
50-59	33	82	18	34	59	4	22	16	41	223
60-69	32	70	17	31	57	2	6	8	14	248
70 or more	38	67	24	32	54	4	2	2	6	226
Ineligible										
Less than 30 years	36	86	20	38	61	6	92	50	40	689
30-39	43	87	21	44	63	7	90	62	64	519
40-49	37	83	22	37	67	6	88	58	50	407
50-59	34	84	22	34	61	3	77	38	19	249
60-69	29	76	24	29	57	5	62	22	13	203
70 or more	39	79	27	33	60	10	36	19	1	78

Table A-14—Food consumption practices, family income, food expenditures, EFNEP families, by food program and family size, 1969

Food program and family size	Homemakers with servings during 24-hour period of–						Families with		Families reporting
	Milk, 2 or more	Meat, 2 or more	Fruit and vegetable, 4 or more	Bread and cereal, 4 or more	1-1-1-1 diet	2-2-4-4 diet	Monthly family income of $200 or more	Monthly family food expenditure of $85 or more	
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Number*
Food stamp:									
1 member	33	67	21	22	49	6	7	1	90
2	27	70	22	35	58	7	15	9	158
3	54	75	26	43	62	8	33	18	125
4	38	80	21	36	64	3	44	37	165
5	39	77	22	44	64	6	51	40	126
6	40	73	21	44	64	7	64	50	178
7	29	78	15	39	55	8	51	47	118
8	36	72	14	47	57	4	53	52	107
9	28	76	18	44	39	2	54	56	80
10 or more	33	81	22	51	62	12	56	53	128
Food distribution:									
1 member	37	73	12	40	63	4	2	0	244
2	39	69	20	40	59	5	14	4	305
3	37	74	18	33	65	4	22	12	238
4	35	80	16	45	62	4	34	20	208
5	36	78	17	43	59	5	39	25	232
6	32	76	15	37	56	6	45	29	215
7	30	79	13	45	53	2	48	38	188
8	33	82	14	38	53	4	52	32	124
9	34	82	10	42	58	4	55	39	116
10 or more	32	82	20	42	55	4	55	43	167
Nonassistance eligible:									
1 member	36	64	17	30	58	3	0	0	253
2	34	75	22	34	59	4	2	4	309
3	36	76	19	34	56	3	14	13	234
4	32	77	15	39	57	5	31	20	274
5	38	77	19	41	57	5	45	33	265
6	34	82	18	45	59	7	52	40	235
7	33	84	18	46	52	6	58	47	218
8	32	77	18	41	56	5	61	50	181
9	37	82	16	37	64	4	62	53	114
10 or more	26	80	13	37	53	3	68	62	223
Ineligible:									
1 member	34	75	22	28	62	6	35	10	167
2	33	79	28	33	62	6	76	22	382
3	37	88	20	41	63	4	88	41	445
4	42	84	24	41	63	9	89	52	456
5	36	88	20	36	62	5	92	62	353
6	36	83	21	41	64	8	93	68	286
7	40	85	23	46	66	8	94	73	166
8	41	84	16	41	61	6	90	80	116
9	34	89	9	42	56	4	93	76	55
10 or more	35	83	15	32	56	4	94	82	68

Table A-15—Food consumption practices, family income and food expenditures, and family income, EFNEP families, by food program status and primary shopping outlet, 1969

Food program and shopping outlet	Homemakers with food group servings during 24-hour period of–						Families with–			Families reporting
	Milk, 2 or more	Meat, 2 or more	Fruit and vegetable, 4 or more	Bread and cereal, 4 or more	1-1-1-1 diet	2-2-4-4 diet	Monthly family income of $200 or more	Monthly family food expenditure of $85 or more	5 members or more	
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Number*
Food stamp:										
Supermarket	39	77	21	41	60	6	49	39	57	937
Local store	30	68	21	39	55	7	26	28	61	264
Both	36	82	14	46	61	7	43	33	46	28
Food distribution:										
Supermarket	36	77	17	42	60	5	39	26	52	1,100
Local store	34	77	14	39	57	4	25	16	51	758
Both	38	86	29	40	57	7	51	33	57	42
Nonassistance eligible:										
Supermarket	35	78	19	39	58	5	40	31	56	1,539
Local store	29	72	15	34	51	4	24	23	46	588
Both	46	89	17	44	62	5	44	38	60	82
Ineligible:										
Supermarket	37	84	23	41	63	7	90	52	44	1,859
Local store	36	82	16	27	57	4	63	43	36	450
Both	43	92	26	38	71	10	82	50	39	105

Table A-16—Food consumption practices, family income and food expenditures, and family size, EFNEP families, by food program status and home garden, 1969

Food Program and presence of home garden	Homemakers with food group servings during 24-hour period of–						Families with–			Families reporting
	Milk, 2 or more	Meat, 2 or more	Fruit and vegetable, 4 or more	Bread and cereal, 4 or more	1-1-1-1 diet	2-2-4-4 diet	Monthly family income of $200 or more	Monthly family food expenditure of $85 or more	5 members or more	
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Number*
Food stamp:										
Yes (have garden)	35	75	21	46	62	6	31	30	59	450
No (do not have)	37	75	20	38	56	7	50	40	58	761
Food distribution:										
Yes	38	78	22	49	63	6	31	19	53	783
No	32	76	12	35	55	3	35	24	50	1,133
Nonassistance eligible:										
Yes	37	76	21	39	60	5	32	27	52	748
No	33	77	16	38	56	4	38	30	54	1,443
Ineligible:										
Yes	36	83	29	42	65	8	90	48	39	604
No	38	85	19	36	62	5	83	51	42	1,770

Table A-17—Food consumption practices, family income and food expenditures, and family size, EFNEP families, by food program status and per capita monthly family income, 1969

Food program and per capita monthly income	Homemakers with food group servings during 24-hour period of–						Families with–			Families reporting
	Milk, 2 or more	Meat, 2 or more	Fruit and vegetable, 4 or more	Bread and cereal, 4 or more	1-1-1-1 diet	2-2-4-4 diet	Monthly family income of $200 or more	Monthly family food expenditure of $85 or more	5 members or more	
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Number*
Food stamp:										
Less than $20	32	78	15	47	55	8	2	18	87	214
$20-$39	34	74	20	43	58	7	44	43	72	353
$40-$59	38	78	24	38	59	7	58	47	50	263
$60-$79	51	70	27	36	66	7	50	33	26	129
$80 or more	41	77	25	37	66	5	67	35	17	145
Food distribution:										
Less than $20	37	78	14	40	56	4	3	10	80	394
$20-$39	35	80	14	43	59	5	39	26	70	571
$40-$59	34	74	19	40	60	4	48	30	42	377
$60-$79	36	74	15	37	58	4	37	22	15	222
$80 or more	37	74	19	38	65	6	41	16	5	221
Nonassistance eligible:										
Less than $20	27	79	12	37	47	2	5	17	81	393
$20-$39	32	79	16	41	55	5	44	36	71	874
$40-$59	38	75	20	38	62	6	53	36	45	589
$60-$79	37	76	22	35	64	5	34	20	10	280
$80 or more	35	64	21	28	61	4	8	8	1	155
Ineligible:										
Less than $20	40	89	5	7	60	0	2	19	67	60
$20-$39	36	81	7	24	54	3	57	55	77	192
$40-$59	37	87	13	40	61	5	89	60	78	512
$60-$79	37	85	23	43	62	8	92	53	50	499
$80 or more	37	83	28	39	65	7	88	45	17	1,226

Table A-18—Food consumption practices, family income and food expenditures, and family size, EFNEP families, by food program status and per capita monthly food expenditure, 1969

Food program and per capita monthly food expenditure	Homemakers with food group servings during 24-hour period of—						Families with—			Families reporting
	Milk, 2 or more	Meat, 2 or more	Fruit and vegetable, 4 or more	Bread and cereal, 4 or more	1-1-1-1 diet	2-2-4-4 diet	Monthly family income of $200 or more	Monthly family food expenditure of $85 or more	5 members or more	
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Number*
Food stamp:										
Less than $10	28	75	15	46	53	7	21	6	82	285
$10-$14	35	77	19	40	59	5	45	37	70	264
$15-$19	41	78	26	38	62	7	55	47	58	200
$20-$24	43	79	27	42	59	10	51	49	40	158
$25-$29	51	69	33	41	64	8	58	60	32	93
$30 or more	39	76	23	34	61	5	51	54	16	119
Food distribution:										
Less than $10	35	78	16	45	54	5	21	5	77	609
$10-$14	34	80	14	38	59	3	39	22	56	413
$15-$19	36	75	18	36	59	4	46	37	45	243
$20-$24	35	78	22	40	66	6	44	40	34	199
$25-$29	39	79	19	42	61	6	36	25	15	115
$30 or more	38	70	14	39	66	5	31	32	7	201
Nonassistance eligible:										
Less than $10	30	78	12	40	52	2	26	6	76	558
$10-$14	32	82	16	40	57	4	50	34	70	554
$15-$19	36	75	19	38	64	6	45	45	53	366
$20-$24	37	76	24	39	63	7	34	35	32	295
$25-$29	39	74	19	35	56	5	35	40	25	161
$30 or more	34	75	23	33	63	4	23	35	10	237
Ineligible:										
Less than $10	36	84	13	40	57	4	75	7	71	181
$10-$14	31	84	18	38	57	5	85	32	68	371
$15-$19	39	84	20	40	68	8	88	45	60	379
$20-$24	38	87	21	38	62	6	86	55	47	455
$25-$29	36	86	28	40	62	9	88	58	31	332
$30 or more	39	83	26	36	64	6	83	66	11	673

Table A-19--Correlation matrix of variables used in regression equations, food stamp participants, 1969

Variables	Age	Family size	Education	White	Black	Spanish American	South	Northeast	North Central	West	Urban	Farm	Nonwelfare	Monthly Income	Monthly Income sq.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Age	1.00	-.33	-.45	-.05	-.08	-.06	.24	-.19	-.09	-.05	-.04	.02	-.07	-.30	-.25
2. Family size		1.00	.07	-.14	.13	.005	.06	-.008	-.04	-.05	-.05	.10	.02	.22	.17
3. Education			1.00	.12	-.08	-.10	-.45	.32	.25	.02	.19	-.12	.14	.42	.36
4. White				1.00	-.89	-.23	-.11	.24	-.02	.12	-.10	-.09	.05	.16	.15
5. Black					1.00	-.25	.19	-.19	.06	-.18	.13	.10	-.03	-.17	-.14
6. Sp. American						1.00	-.16	-.09	-.10	.64	-.07	-.02	-.04	.01	-.02
7. South							1.00	-.57	-.54	-.30	-.28	.23	-.04	-.56	-.49
8. Northeast								1.00	-.21	-.11	.08	-.12	.21	.50	.50
9. N. Central									1.00	-.11	.34	-.16	-.16	.21	.15
10. West										1.00	-.07	-.02	-.02	.02	-.02
11. Urban											1.00	-.34	-.18	.12	.10
12. Farm												1.00	.11	-.18	-.15
13. Nonwelfare													1.00	.24	.26
14. Mo. income														1.00	.95
15. Mo. income sq.															1.00

SOURCE: Computer printouts.

Table A-20--Correlation matrix of variables used in regression equations, food distribution families, 1969

Variables	Age	Family size	Education	White	Black	Spanish American	South	Northeast	North Central	West	Urban	Farm	Nonwelfare	Monthly Income	Monthly Income sq.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Age	1.00	-.51	-.34	.12	-.06	-.15	.10	-.04	-.10	.05	-.12	.004	-.07	-.32	-.25
2. Family size		1.00	.11	-.20	.16	.09	-.04	-.09	.13	-.04	-.06	.12	.08	.43	.38
3. Education			1.00	-.009	.08	-.17	-.12	.14	.02	.005	.11	-.04	.06	.19	.14
4. White				1.00	-.92	-.16	-.24	.20	.11	.04	-.16	.03	.02	-.02	-.04
5. Black					1.00	-.25	.26	-.27	-.08	-.04	.09	.003	.02	-.03	-.01
6. Spanish American						1.00	-.06	.16	-.07	-.006	.17	-.08	-.08	.11	.12
7. South							1.00	-.64	-.68	-.06	.002	.02	-.02	-.19	-.16
8. Northeast								1.00	-.12	-.01	-.04	-.12	-.05	.12	.12
9. North Central									1.00	-.01	.04	.09	.07	.13	.10
10. West										1.00	-.03	-.01	-.03	-.03	-.02
11. Urban											1.00	-.33	-.14	.10	.07
12. Farm												1.00	.16	-.05	-.05
13. Nonwelfare													1.00	.08	.08
14. Monthly income														1.00	.94
15. Monthly income sq															1.00

SOURCE: Computer printouts.

Table A-21--Correlation matrix of variables used in regression equations, eligible nonparticipants, 1969

Variables	Age	Family size	Education	White	Black	Spanish American	South	Northeast	North Central	West	Urban	Farm	Non-welfare	Monthly income	Monthly income sq.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Age	1.00	-.43	-.42	.03	.02	-.10	.11	-.08	-.07	-.03	-.05	.03	-.10	-.35	-.28
2. Family size		1.00	.18	-.14	.10	.05	.02	-.05	.02	-.01	-.05	.06	.15	.59	.56
3. Education			1.00	.05	.04	-.16	-.19	.06	.17	.07	.07	-.04	.06	.26	.22
4. White				1.00	-.86	-.18	-.15	.08	.12	.004	-.17	.07	-.02	.06	.06
5. Black					1.00	-.35	.17	-.12	-.07	-.11	.10	-.03	.01	-.09	-.08
6. Sp. American						1.00	-.05	.08	-.10	.19	.13	-.06	.02	.06	.04
7. South							1.00	-.51	-.72	-.30	-.18	.09	.11	-.34	-.35
8. Northeast								1.00	-.10	-.04	.08	-.09	-.10	.20	.22
9. North Central									1.00	-.06	.16	-.04	-.03	.25	.25
10. West										1.00	.02	.005	.06	.06	.04
11. Urban											1.00	-.37	-.13	.10	.09
12. Farm												1.00	.16	-.08	-.07
13. Nonwelfare													1.00	.09	.09
14. Monthly income														1.00	.95
15. Monthly income sq															1.00

SOURCE: Computer printouts.

Table A-22--Correlation matrix of variables used in regression equations, nonassistance ineligible families, 1969

Variables	Age	Family size	Education	White	Black	Spanish American	South	Northeast	North Central	West	Urban	Farm	Non-welfare	Monthly income	Monthly income Sq.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Age	1.00	-.29	-.36	.008	.04	-.08	.09	-.03	-.04	-.08	.02	.07	-.23	-.27	-.20
2. Family size		1.00	.07	-.07	.03	.06	-.04	-.02	.04	.05	-.07	-.008	.06	.42	.34
3. Education			1.00	.05	.12	-.25	-.20	.07	.15	.09	.02	-.01	.16	.28	.24
4. White				1.00	-.77	-.27	-.14	.05	.11	.05	-.22	.17	-.06	.06	.06
5. Black					1.00	-.40	.14	-.05	-.05	-.14	.11	-.10	.04	-.06	-.04
6. Spanish-American						1.00	-.008	.01	-.09	.14	.15	-.10	.03	-.005	-.02
7. South							1.00	-.45	-.71	-.39	-.10	.05	-.01	-.34	-.32
8. Northeast								1.00	-.09	-.05	.01	-.05	.02	.17	.17
9. North Central									1.00	-.08	.09	-.02	.003	.23	.21
10. West										1.00	.03	-.01	.01	.14	.13
11. Urban											1.00	-.33	-.02	.004	.02
12. Farm												1.00	.04	-.02	-.02
13. Nonwelfare													1.00	.19	.15
14. Monthly income														1.00	.97
15. Monthly income sq															1.00

SOURCE: Computer printouts.